This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY

FOR

1844-45 AND 1845-46.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY RICHARD AND JOHN E. TAYLOR,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

1846.

due regard to the foregoing considerations can rarely be comprised within the limits allowed to etymological inquiry in our ordinary dictionaries, and it would be far better to make it the subject of a separate work, apart from the regular lexicography of the language.

We have only to look at Ihre's excellent Lexicon Suio-Gothicum to see how interesting a work of this nature might be made by the study of our own language with even a somewhat superficial knowledge of the cognate tongues. In such a work there would be ample room for many contributors, and a field peculiarly adapted, as the author conceived, for the cooperation of the members of the Philological Society. It often happens to the philological student in the course of his reading to make out to his own entire satisfaction the origin and explanation of detached expressions, which become lost to science solely from the want of a convenient means of communication. To give an instance: the author a short time back was struck with a passage in Pepys' Diary*, in which he speaks of the "coal harbour" among the outhouses of the Tower. The moment it appeared that the place where fuel was kept was formerly known by this name, it occurred at once that we had here the origin of those innumerable "cold harbours" which have caused so much discussion, being everywhere scattered over the face of our county maps in such abundance, that Hartshorne, in his 'Salopia Antiqua,' has been able to enumerate no fewer than seventy-one. When wood was the only fuel, the wood-yard for the supply of the surrounding district must have been an important object in every neighbourhood. If it were known that the Society invited such communications, we might perhaps be the means of preserving much valuable knowledge, and might gradually accumulate materials for an etymology of the English language, for which, at the present day, we have little to show beyond the uncertain guesses of Junius and Skinner.

In the following specimens the author has endeavoured to exemplify his own idea of what is wanting in this department of science, and at the same time to show how much satisfaction may frequently be attained without digging very deep beneath the surface. For this purpose he has taken a few examples of words at the commencement of the alphabet, ill understood or insufficiently accounted for in the standard authorities, and has thought it better to support his views by such positive evidence as he could produce, with as little criticism as possible on the speculations of preceding authors.

Abandon.—The word "ban" is common to all the languages of the Teutonic stock in the sense of proclamation, publication; remaining with us in the expression "banns of marriage." Passing into the romance tongues, this word became "bando" in Italian and Spanish, an edict or proclamation; "bandon" in French, in the same sense, and secondarily, command, orders, dominion, power: à son bandon, at his own discretion.

---

* "He went into several little cellars and then went out a-doors to view, and to the Cole-Harbour, but none did answer so well to the marks which was given him to find it by, as one arched vault."—Pepys, i. 329.

Great loos hath largesse and great prise,
For both the wise folk and unwise
Were wholly to her *bandon* brought,
So well with yeftis has she wrought.—Chaucer, R. R. 1160.

In the original,

Les saiges avait et les fols
Communement à son *bandon*.
(She had them at her command.)

Alangst the land of Ross he roars,
And all obeyed at his *bandown*,
Even frae the north to suthren shoars.
Battle of Harlaw in Jamieson.

Sone thei raised strif, brent the kynge's townes,
And his castles took—held them in their *bandown*.—R. Brunne.

Hence, to abandon or embandon is to bring under the absolute command or entire control of any one: to subdue, rule, have entire dominion over him.

Oft syss quhen it wald him like,
He went till huntynge with his menye,
And swa the land *abandownyt* he
That none durst warne (refuse) to do his will.—Bruce, iv. 391.

And he that thryll (thrall) is is nocht his
All that he has *embandownyt* is
Unto his lord, whatever he be. Id. i. 244.

The hardy Bruce ane ost *abandownyt*
Twenty thousand he rewllyt be force and wit
Upon the Scottis his men for to reskew. Wallace, x. 317.

The king rycht weill resawyt he,
And wndretuk his man to be,
And him and his on mony wyss,
He *abandownyt* till his service. Bruce, iii. 130.

He that dredeth God wol do diligence to plese God by his werkes and *abandon* himself with all his might well for to do.—Chaucer in Richardson.

Kenneth exhorted his folkis to assailye feirsly their ennymes and to perseveir in fervent battail, that it may be discussed be the day quhidder the Scottis shall *abandown* the Pichtis, or the Pichtis the Scottis.—Bellenden in Jamieson.

Now as that which is placed at the absolute command of one party must by the same act be entirely given up by the original possessor, it was a very easy step from the sense of conferring the command of a thing upon some particular person, to that of renouncing all claim to authority over the subject-matter, without particular reference to the party into whose hands it might come; and thus in modern times the word has come to be used almost exclusively in the sense of renunciation or desertion.

The adverbial expressions "at abandon," "bandonly," "abandonly," so common in the 'Bruce' and 'Wallace,' may be understood by reference to the French "à son bandon," "à bandon," pro arbitrio, at his own will and pleasure, at his own impulse, uncontrolledly, impetuously, courageously, determinedly.

The Sotherons saw how that so *bandownly*,
Wallace abaid ner hand their chivalry.—Wallace, v. 881.

The Scottis men dang on sa fast,
And schot on thaim *at abandown*,
As ilk man were a campioun,
That all their fayis tuk the flycht. Bruce, xv. 59.

The king that had thar with him then
Weill fyve thousand wycht and worthi
Saw thai twa sa *abandownly*
Schut amang thaim and come sa ner
He wyst rycht weill withoutyn wer
That thai rycht ner suppowall had. Bruce, ii. 105.

Abash.—This word was formerly used in the sense of putting to confusion from any strong emotion, whether of fear, of wonder, shame, or admiration:—

And with that word came Drede avaunt,
Which was *abashed*, and in great fere
When he wist Jealosie was nere:
He was for drede in such affray
That not a worde durst he say. Chaucer, R. R.

In modern times the use of the word has been confined to the emotion of shame, and this restricted sense of the word has thrown etymologists on a wrong scent in seeking for the derivation.

Abash is an adoption of the French *esbahir* (to which it has often been referred) as sounded in the greater number of the inflexions, *esbahissons, esbahissez, esbahissant.*

To convert the word thus inflected into English, it was natural to curtail merely the terminations *ons, ez, ant,* by which the inflexions differed from each other, and the verb was written in English to *abaisse*, or *abaish.*

So we render *ravir*, ravish; *polir*, polish; *fournir*, furnish, &c.

Many verbs of this form derived from the French were formerly written indifferently with or without a final *sh*, where custom has rendered one or the other of the two modes of spelling obsolete.

Thus in Chaucer we find burnish written "burny"; astonish, "astony"; betray "betrash"; obey, "obeisse" (or "obeyshe" in Robert of Gloucester). Speaking of Narcissus stooping to drik the poet writes:—

In the water anon was sene
His nose, his mouth, his eyen shene,
And he thereof was all *abashed*,
His owne shadow had him *betrashed*;
For well he wened the forme to see
Of a childe of full grete beauté. R. R. 1520.

In the original—

Et il maintenant *s'ébahit*,
Car son umbre si le *trahit*,
Car il cuida voir la figure
D'ung enfant bel à demésure.

In like manner *abash* was formerly written "abay" or "abaw" as well as "abaysse" or "abaish":—

I saw the rose when I was nigh,
It was thereon a goodly sight—
For such another as I gesse
Aforne ne was nor more vermeille,
I was *abawid* for merveille. R. R. 3645.

In the original—

Moult *m'ebahis* de la merveille.

Yield you madame on hicht can schir last say,
A word scho could not speak she was so *abayd*.
K. Hart in Jamieson.

Custom, which has rendered obsolete betrash and obeish, has exercised her authority in like manner over abay or abaw, burny, astony.

The origin of esbahir itself is to be found in the old French "baer," "béer," to open the mouth, an onomatopœia, from the noise most naturally made by the lips in that action. Hence "baer" or "béer," in a secondary application, is used to signify the doing of anything the natural tendency of which is to manifest itself by an involuntary opening of the mouth; to be struck with wonder; to be intent upon anything; and *esbahir* in the active form, is to strike with feelings of such a nature, to confound, to set agape:—

In himself was all his state
More solemn than the tedious pomp which waits
On princes when their rich retinue long
Of horses led, and grooms besmear'd with gold,
Dazzles the crowd and *sets them all agape*.—Milton, P. L.

Accoutre.—To equip with the habiliments of some particular office or occupation, an act, of which, in catholic countries, the frequent change of vestments at appointed periods of the church service would afford a striking and familiar example.

Now the person who had charge of the vestments in a catholic church was the sacristan, in Latin *custos sacrarii* or *ecclesiæ* (barbarously feminized into *custrix* when the office was filled by a woman), in old French, "cousteur" or "coustre," "coutre." German "küster," the sacristan or vestry-keeper.—Ludwig.

Ad custodem sacrarii pertinet cura vel custodia templi—vela *vestesque sacræ* ac vasa sacrorum, &c.—St. Isidore in Ducange.

We see accordingly in the year 1473 an inventory of the jewels, ornaments, hangings, *vestments* (*parements*), books and other goods belonging to the church of Notre Dame at Bayeux, taken in the presence of the servants and procurators of the "grand *cousteur* de la dite Eglise."

The primitive idea in *accoustrer* would thus be to perform the office of sacristan to any one, to invest him with habiliments analogous to those employed by the priest in performing public service.

Afford, Affere.—We find the word "forum" in Ducange in the sense not only of *market*, but also of *market-price*, in old French *feur* or *fuer*.

Hence afforer or affeurer, to tax or appraise a thing. Afforer or affeurer le vin, was to set a price at which, after payment of the *droit d'afforage* to the feudal lord, the wine might lawfully be sold by retail.

From affeurer we have "to affere," in the same sense. Our *afferors* were persons whose duty it was to tax or assess the fines imposed by the courts upon individuals according to their means :—

Et quod amerciamenta prædictorum tenentium *afferentur* et taxentur per sacramentum parium suorum.—Charter of 1316 in Ducange.

From "afforer," the more original mode of spelling the word, comes our "afford." Merchandise would be *affored* upon which a certain price was set: and "to affor'd it" would be to allow it to go at the price *affored.* In support of this view of the origin of the final *d*, we may cite the two following examples, quoted by Richardson in his Dictionary :—

[There is] no such offering of Christ in the Scripture where you will find it once *afford* for all.—Sheldon in Richardson.

Parolles. I would the cutting of my garments wold serve the turne, or the breaking of my Spanish sword.
1st Lord. We cannot *affoor'd* you so.—All's well that ends well, Act. iv.

In the first of these examples, "afford" is obviously used as a past participle, implying that the offering was valued as an offering for all, thought worthy of that price.

In the other example, though used as a verb, "affoor'd" is written as a participle with an apostrophe before the *d.*

ATTERCOP, COBWEB.—Attercop is still in use in the North of England for a spider. A. S. ator-coppa, from ator, venom; Isl. eitr. Eitr-orm, a poisonous snake, an adder.

The remaining element cop or cob, which survives in our cobweb, and in the Dutch "spinne-kop," has not been satisfactorily explained. It is interpreted *cup* by Jamieson, *head* by Boucher, but neither poison-cup nor poison-head would be a very appropriate designation of a spider, and still less spin-cup or spin-head, to which we should be led by the Dutch expression.

We find however in Frisian, "kop," a bubble, blister, "bleb," *pock*, of which latter indeed it seems to be a mere inversion, just as our pot is the German "topf." "T'waer kopet," the water boils; "börne koppar," Isl. the small-pox. Atter-cop would thus be equivalent to poison-pock, venom-bag.

In the old Swedish, according to Ihre, kopp was used to designate a *bee*; the word being probably in the first instance honey-kopp, from whence the honey was dropped in the course of time, in the same way that the initial "atter" has disappeared in Flanders, leaving kopp, koppe, as the designation of a spider. The contrast between the bee and the spider as collectors, the one of sweets and the other of poison, is of very old standing.

2. "On the Ellipsis of the Verb in English Syntax." By Edwin Guest, Esq.

The word *ellipsis* will be used on the present occasion with the same latitude of meaning as in a former paper. Cases of real ellipsis are comparatively rare, and it often requires a very minute acquaintance with the history of grammar, to determine whether a sentence apparently defective has or has not originated in one more perfect. If we confine our attention to what has been termed *logical ellipsis*, we soon find ourselves entangled in all the refinements of metaphysical distinction; and metaphysics, though they have often afforded a very convenient shelter to the philologist, have hitherto, it is apprehended, done little to advance the science of philology. The first object of this, as of every other science, is arrangement; and if we cannot attain to a natural arrangement—if our knowledge will not enable us to draw the line which separates the real from the merely apparent ellipsis—we may show our wisdom by following the example of other grammarians, and not clogging ourselves with conditions which nobody has yet succeeded in carrying out consistently. An ellipsis, therefore, as the term is here used, will include the real or historical ellipsis, the logical ellipsis, and also any construction which, according to the present usage of our language, may be considered as defective.

In present usage, our language rarely admits an ellipsis of the *copula*, unless where the predicate is transposed so as to come before the subject, and the latter is preceded by the definite article or possessive pronoun. In such cases of transposition the ellipsis is too common to need examples, but there is a peculiarity in Milton's use of the idiom which may perhaps deserve notice. After this ellipsis, he very generally in the next clause of the sentence omits the personal pronoun:—

1. *Dagon his name*: sea-monster, upward man
And downward fish, yet had (he) his temple high
Rear'd in Azotus. P. L. 1. 462.

2. — *cruel his eye*, but (it) cast
Signs of remorse. P. L. 1. 594.

3. *Vain wisdom all and false philosophy*,
Yet with a pleasing sorcery could (it) charm. P. L. 2. 565.

When the words follow in their natural sequence, the omission of the copula is much less frequent, though instances of it are occasionally to be met with:—

4. *Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats*; but God shall destroy both it and them.—1 Cor. vi. 13.

5. — many rivers clear
Here glide in silver swathes,
And *what of all most dear*,
Buxton's delicious baths,
Strong ale and noble cheer. Drayton.

6. — by law thou art condemn'd to die—
Yet this my comfort: when your words are done,
My woes end likewise, &c. Com. of Errors, 1. 1.

7. — *what noise there?* ho—
No noise, my lord, but needful conference. W. T. 2. 3.

In the earlier periods of our language, this ellipsis was common in such clauses as began with the conjunction copulative; and after the conjunctions "continuative" *yet* and *though,* it kept its ground in our literature till comparatively recent times:—

8. Þo þis strong men was slawe, þat so strong was in fyȝt
Ys men bi gonne to fle, *and fayn þat heo myȝt.* Rob. Glou. 121·

9. — a prince, as hit were,
By nom hym ys housewyf and heeld hire hym self
And Abraam nat hardy ones to letten hym.
Vis. de Dowel, pass. 4. p. 215. Whit. ed.

10. — semivivus he semede,
And naked as a neelde, *and non help aboute hym.*
Vis. de Dobet, pass. 3. p. 324. Whit. ed.

11. My son shulle in a madyn light
Agens the feynd of helle to fight,
Withoutyn wem, as son thrugh glas
And she madyn, as she was. Townl. Myst. 73.

12. — drevin to the seis, quhare ane part of thaime eschapit be fischear batis, *and the residew vincust and slane.*—Bell. Chron. 2. 19.

13. So may he ever do! and ever flourish
When I shall dwell with worms, *and my poor name*
Banish'd the kingdom. Hen. VIII. 4. 2.

14. Worst in this royal presence may I speak,
Yet best beseeming me to speak the truth. Rich. II. 4. 1.

15. Youth to itself rebels, *though none else near.*—Hamlet, 1. 3.

16. — you, whom I could pity thus forlorn,
Though I unpitied. P. L. 1. 374.

17. — the mind and spirit remains
Invincible, and vigour soon returns,
Though all our glory extinct and happy state
Here swallow'd up in endless misery. P. L. 1. 139.

When a sentence, or clause of a sentence contains some general assertion, it frequently opens with one of the pronouns indeterminate in construction with the verb substantive,—*it is, there are,* &c. Our older writers, in such cases, sometimes omitted both verb and pronoun:—

18. Lewede men cunne French non
Among an hondryd unnethis on,
And nevertheles with glad chere
Fele of hem that wolde here
Noble justis. R. Cœur de Lion, 26.

19. I see toppys of hyllis he, many at a sight
Nothing to let me, the wedyr is so bright.—Townl. Myst. 32.

20. — there was a noise—
That 's verity; *best stand upon our guard.* Temp. 2. 1.

When the infinitive of the verb substantive, in construction with an accusative, follows certain verbs, we may at our option insert or omit it; thus we may say, *you thought him honest, it made me unwell,* &c., or *you thought him to be honest,* &c. In the earlier stages of our language the infinitive was omitted after many verbs which no longer allow of its ellipsis; for instance, after the verbs *to do, to know, to show, to hear,* &c.:—

21. An oratorie—
In worship of Diane of chastite,
Hath Theseus done wrought in noble wise.
Chau. The Knightes Tale, 1065.

22. — quit his fortunes here
(Which you *knew great*), and to the certain hazard
Of all uncertainties himself commended. W. T. 3. 2.

23. Let Fergus goist *knaw us good men, luffaris of vertew, and not unmindful of gud dedes.*—Bell, Chron. 2. 1.

24. — desiring—to have support aganis the auld inhabitantis of Ireland, and *shawand thame, ane wild pepill, impacient,* &c.—Bell, Chron. 1. 3.

25. The residew of the Britonis—*herand thair king slane,* and thair army discomfist send an herald, &c.—Bell, Chron. 1. 10.

26. — sought in vain,
And nowhere finding, rather *fear'd her slain.*—Dryden.

Hath done wrought in ex. 21. is equivalent to *hath caused to be wrought.*

Some of the most curious instances of ellipsis are found in cases where the auxiliaries enter into combination with the verb. The verb is generally the subject of the ellipsis, but the auxiliary *have* was omitted both in the past tense infinitive and also after the auxiliaries *may, can, will, shall,* &c.

27. If I had had the giftes of grace,
I never would have sought,
By any meanes such worldly trashe
With brother's bloud *to bought.*
Higgins, M. for M. King Ferrex, 1st edit.

28. —I hed like *to been drownt.*—Wheeler's Westm. Dial.

29. — teak freet an ran oway, brak oa'th gear, fearfully leaamd his showder an like *to kilt me.*—Wheeler's Westm. Dial.

30. She'd a good mind *to went.*—Bachelor's Bedfordsh. Dial. p. 132.

31. I wald sum clerk of conyng *wald declerde,*
Quhat gerris this warld be turnyt up so down.
Merser, Ballade against the Times.

32. Your lege ye layd and your aly,
Your franticke fable not worth a fly,
Frenche king, or one or other
Regarded ye should your lord, your brother.
Skelton, Against the Scottes.

33. I am that Malin, one of Madan's sons,
Which thought to raigne and rule this noble isle,
And *would so done,* but &c.—Higgins, M. for M. King Malin, 5.

34. If he had bene a God (as sots him nam'd),
He could not of us Bretaynes *taken foile.*
Higgins, M. for M. Lord Nennius, 31.

35. Yet if *I might* my quarrel *try'd** with thee,
Thou never had'st retournde.
Higgins, M. for M. King Nennius, 27.

---

* Niccols's edition reads "I had," and the edition of 1575 "have tried." It is thus our editors pare down our vernacular idiom. Even Milton's English has been "corrected"!

36. Yet would to God he had returnde again,
So that *I might* but once the dotard *spyde.*
Higgins, M. for M. King Nennius, 33.

37. Mary! *I wad* full fain *heard* some question tween you twain.—Hen. V. 3. 2.

38. And frae his harp sic strains did flow
Might rous'd the slumbering dead. Burns's Vision.

39. What further clish-ma-clavers *might been said,*
No man can tell. Burns's Brigs of Ayr.

40. — a ribbon at your lug
Wad been a dress completer. Burns's Dream.

This ellipsis is common in the Swedish. With us it seems to have prevailed chiefly in our northern dialects, and Shakespeare, in the only place where he uses it (ex. 37), puts it into the mouth of a Scotchman. It must however have been known to our other dialects, for Higgins, who employs it so frequently, was a West-of-England man.

In the far larger proportion of these cases, the auxiliary is expressed, and the supplementary part of the verb omitted. For example, when the past tense is coupled with the future, or with some combination of the verb expressing future time, the auxiliary *have* is often used without its participle:—

41. — like silly beggars
Who sitting in the stocks refuge their shame
That many *have* and others must sit there. Rich. II. 5. 5.

42. — my loyalty,
Which ever *has* and ever shall be growing
Till death, that winter, kill it. Hen. VIII. 3. 2.

43. — for your highness' good I ever labour'd
More than my own; that am, *have*, and shall be.—Hen. VIII. 3. 2.

44. This dedication may serve for almost any book that *has*, is, or shall be published.—Bolingbroke.

Again, the infinitive is often omitted after the auxiliaries *may, can, will, shall,* &c., when another form or combination of the verb occurs in the same sentence:—

45. Aungel, I sey to yow
In what manere of wyse xal this be?
Ffor knowing of man I have non now,
I have evermore kept and xal my verginite. Cov. Myst. 113.

46. But *it is said and ever shall*
Betwene two stooles is the fall. Gower, fol. 2.

47. *Ich am* sory for my synnes and so *shal ich* evere.
P. Plouhman, pass. 8. Whit. ed.

48. And he that mover is of all
That *is or was or ever shall,*
So give hem joy. Chau. H. of Fame.

49. Men dreme of thing that never *was nor shall.*
Chau. The Nonnes Preestes Tale, 430.

50. You *were* as flowers new wither'd, even so
These herblets *shall,* which we upon you throw.—Cymb. 4. 2.

51. — garland—which I feel
I am not worthy yet to bear, *I shall*
Assuredly. Hen. VIII. 4. 2.

52. Emperour he *was*,
Þe noblest þat *my3te* bote þat he Cristine nas. R. Gl. 71.

53. —he wole al out hem brynge of þe daunger of Rome,
And deliuer þis land of Romaynes and of stronge men ech on,
Þat so fre lond as þis, *ne schulde* nower non. R. Gl. 78.

54. A! ho had evyr suche a chylde?
Nevyr creature 3it that evyr was bore!
Sche *is* so gracyous, sche is so mylde—
So *xulde* childyr to fadyr and modyr evyr more.—Cov. Myst. 81.

55. — *be* to yourself,
As you *would* to your friend. Hen. VIII. 1. 1.

In ex. 53. we have an ellipsis of the verb in *both* clauses of the sentence; and perhaps the idiom we have been considering may be looked upon as merely a particular case of one more general, which may be thus defined: after the auxiliaries *may, can, will, shall,* &c., the infinitive may be omitted whenever the construction of the sentence is such as readily to suggest it.

A very common ellipsis omits the verb when it signifies the performance of some act referred to or suggested in the sentence. In the following examples, the verb supposed to be the subject of the ellipsis is placed within brackets:

56. — I am taught to be filled and to hungre and to abound and to suffre myseiste. I *may* (do) *alle thingis* in him that comforteth me.—Wicl. Fil. 4.

57. — he that *most may* when he syttes in pride
When it comes on assay is kesten downe wyde.—Townl. Myst. 84.

58. I have seen myself and served against the French,
And *they can* (do duty) *well* on horseback. Hamlet, 4. 6.

59. Mecænas and Agrippa, *who can most*
With Cæsar, are his friends. Dryden.

60. Swete systeres to 3ow alle I knele
To receyve I beseche your charite—
They xal (yield it) dowtere. Cov. Myst. p. 86.

61. The mason sware grete athes him to
That *he sold* (do) whatsom he wolde
And never tel man on this molde.—The Sevyn Sages, 3055.

An ellipsis of the verb *to go* is exceedingly common after the auxiliaries *will, shall, would,* &c. when coupled with some adverb or preposition signifying motion to or from a place.

62. Desolate, desolate *will I hence* and die. Rich. II. 1. 2.

63. Then buckling close, doth not at random hack
On the hard cuirass on his enemies back,
But under's belly (cunning) finds a skin
Where (and but there) his sharpen'd blade *will in*.
Sylv. Du Bartas, 6th day.

64. — he beheld aboute
Þe dures were so sperd, he *myght in no stede oute*.—R. Br. 93.

65. — they *will out of their burrows*, like conies after rain, and revel all with him.—Cor. 4. 5.

66. — I wote *wheder I shalle*;
In helle I wote mon be my stalle. Townl. Myst. 16.

67. I yet remember
Some of these articles, and *out they shall*.—Hen. VIII. 3. 2.

68. — Þer nas so god knyȝt non nower in France,
Þat in joustes scholde at sitte þe dynt of ys lance
Þat he *ne schulde a down*. R. Gl. 137.

69. Than by my lay Y dare well swere
They schull a down. Octov. 1722.

70. If I had a thunderbolt in my eye, I can tell, *who should down*.—As You Like It, 1. 2.

71. Constantin *walde after* and warpen him þeonne,
Constantine would after and drive him thence.—St. Catherine, 18.

72. You *must to Pomfret*, not unto the Tower.—Rich. II. 1. 2.

The infinitive of the verb *to have* seems to have been omitted after the auxiliaries *will* or *would*; at least the idiom, according to the present usage of our language, would be considered as defective.

73. — corouned Dufnald, Sir Malcolme broþer,
His sonnes *þei ne wald*, þe ton no þe toþer. R. Br. 90.

74. Yei dele aboute the, for *I wille* none. Townl. Myst. 16.

75. *I wol no woman* thirty yere of age,
It is but bene straw. Chau. March. Tale, 177.

76. Anne Bullen! no; *I 'll no Anne Bullens* for him,
There is more in it than fair feature,—Bullen,
No, *we 'll no Bullens*. Hen. VIII. 3. 2.

77. Peace! foolish woman—
I will not peace. Rich. II. 5. 1.

The above are the most usual cases in which the verb is omitted after the auxiliaries, but other instances of its ellipsis are sometimes met with. The following may serve as examples:—

78. The kynd of the shalle sprede wide
From eest to west on every syde,
From the southe unto the northe
Alle that I say *I shalle* (bring) *forth*. Townl. Myst. 45.

79. To the fare *will I* (betake) *me*. Townl. Myst. 85.

80. English John Talbot, captains, calls you forth,
And thus *he would* (say)—Open your city gates,
Be humble to us, call my sovereign yours,
And do him homage as obedient servants,
And I'll withdraw me. 1 Hen. VI. 4. 2.

The verb *to go*, when accompanied with an adverb or preposition signifying motion to or from a place, is sometimes omitted, even though there be no auxiliary;—

81. *Out of my doors*, you witch, you hag.—Mer. W. of Windsor.

82. — he 's gone to serve the duke of Florence,
We met him *thitherward*. All's Well that Ends Well, 3. 2.

83. — *to him again,* entreat him,
Kneel down before him. M. for Meas.

84. With that *she to him again,* and surely would have put out his eyes, &c.—Sydney's Arcadia.

Shakespeare also employs other idioms, which at the present day would require the infinitive of the verbs *to go* or *to come,* and which may remind us of the idioms *ad cœnam condicere* vel *promittere,* or of the Ciceronian phrases *in Pompeianum* vel *in suburbanum cogitare.*

85. I would *desire*
My famous cousin to the Grecian tents. T. and Cr. 4. 5.

86. *Desire him home.* T. and Cr. 4. 5.

87. Good sometime queen, *prepare thee hence for France.*—Rich. II. 5. 1.

The verb *to say,* like *to go,* is omitted not only after an auxiliary (ex. 80), but also occasionally under other circumstances :—

88. But off the town *the chef amyrayle*
(His name was callyd Tryabaute)
Lord ar thou geve us assawte,
Alle the folk of this toun
Proffer hem to knely adoun. Rich. Cœur de Lion, 2858.

This English idiom seems to have authorized the ellipsis which Milton uses so frequently :—

89. *To whom thus Jesus,* "What concludest thou hence," &c.—P. R.

though the classical associations connected with it were probably its chief recommendation in the eyes of the poet.

A change from the third to the first or second pronoun personal, without any of the usual introductory phrases, *he said,* &c., was very common in our earlier literature; and the use of this figure in our classical poetry has been very unnecessarily traced by Addison and others to a Greek or Roman original. A deeper insight into the history of our language will no doubt greatly lessen the number of Milton's "Latinisms."

90. Conscience knelynge, to þe king loutede
To wite what his will were, and what he do sholde:
Wolt thou wedde þis maide, if ich wolle assente,
For hue ys fayne of þy felauship, and for to be þy make, &c.
P. Plouh. pass. 4. Whit. ed.

91. A gret fawchin in hand he bare,
Come fyte with me now who that dare.—Rich. C. de Lion, 4510.

92. þe kyng hym bisouht, als clerk of dignite,
To coroune Helianoure, *that biseke I þe.* R. Br. 73.

93. — adored
The God that made both sky, air, earth and heaven
Which they beheld, the moon's resplendent lamp,
And starry pole; *thou also madest the night,*
Maker omnipotent, and thou the day,
Which we, &c. P. L. 4. 723.

This ellipsis however in our older dialect was more generally introduced by one of the conjunctions, *ac* or *and* :—

94. Þe Romaynes seide eke þat heo nolde in no maner so wende
Out of here land hiderward, ne heore power so sende,
Ac *ȝe schulde of oure yonge folke teche for to fiȝte*, &c.
R. Glou. 99.

95. Tho were faitours aferede and feynede hem blinde—
And maden here more to Peers, how thei mowe nat wirche
Ac *we prayeth for ȝou Peers, and fore ȝoure plouh bothe,*
Þat God for hus grace, ȝoure grain multiplie.
P. Plouh. pass. 9. Whit. ed.

96. Treuthe sent hym a lettere,
And bad hym bygge baldly, what hym best lykede,
And sitthen sellen hit a ȝein, and save þe wynnynges
Amenden Meson dieux þer with, and myseyse men fynde—
And *ich shal sende ȝow myselue Seynt Mychel myn aungel*
That no devel shal ȝow dere. P. Plouh. pass. 10. Whit. ed.

97. The kyng commanded knygtes tho
To the cite for to goo
And *take the palmeres alle three*
And bring hem her before me. Rich. Cœur de Lion, 698.

In similar constructions, we sometimes find the verb *to ask* omitted:—

98. And ich a roos right up with þat, and reverencede hym fayre,
And *if hus wil were, he wolde hus name telle.*
Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 4. Whit. ed.

When some act has been done in order to determine that which is doubtful, the clause which explains the motive is generally introduced with some such phrase as *to know whether, to see if,* &c. Our older writers generally used the conjunction without the verb:—

99. Thus thei vysyted the Holy Land
How they myght wynne it to her hand.—Rich. C. de Lion, 646.

100. — in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves, *if God peradventure will give them repentance,* &c.—2 Tim. ii. 25.

101. — as a wolf, that hunting for a prey,
And having stol'n at last some lamb away,
Flyes with down-hanging head, and leareth back,
Whether the mastif doo pursue his track.
Sylv. Du Bartas, 5th day.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Vol. II. DECEMBER 13, 1844. No. 27.

The Rev. Dr. Hawtrey in the Chair.

A Grammar of the Persian Language, by Duncan Forbes, A.M. second edition: London, 1844, was laid on the table,—presented by the author.

The following papers were read:—

1. "On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands:"—*Continued.* By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

In proceeding to give some account of the dialects which immediately succeeded, and to a considerable extent supplanted the British Celtic, it is proposed to commence with those peculiar to our Northern provinces, not as being necessarily first in order, but as those which upon the whole are the most susceptible of classification and illustration.

As the invading Saxons consisted of several different tribes, it is reasonable to presume, from known analogies, that diversities of dialect already prevailed among them; and this presumption is confirmed by incidental expressions of Bede and other early writers. The Mercians of the midland provinces, the three divisions of East, Middle and North Angles, and the Northumbrians, extending from the Humber to the Forth, are distinctly stated to have been descendants of the Angli, who were a powerful tribe on the continent as early as the time of Tacitus. We know that those northern tribes had their popular and religious poetry, and, in process of time, vernacular translations from the Scriptures and other devotional works, entirely or chiefly in their own dialect. For example: the poems of Cædmon, a native of the north-east of Yorkshire, were not, we may presume, originally in the ordinary West-Saxon dialect, in which we now have them, but in the form exhibited in the specimen, unfortunately very brief, printed by Wanley from an ancient manuscript. An elaborate analysis of the peculiarities of this fragment, by Professor Halbertsma, will be found in the introduction to Dr. Bosworth's Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. The Runic inscription on the Ruthwell Cross, illustrated by Mr. Kemble, and the verses said to have been pronounced by Bede on his death-bed, as given in the St. Gallen manuscript of Cuthbert's letter, relating his last moments, present the same peculiarities of form and orthography, but they are too scanty to afford us anything approaching to a view of the dialect as a whole. Some monuments have however survived the general wreck of the Northumbrian and Anglian literature, of considerable value in a philological point of view. The first in time and importance, but which has not hitherto met with the attention that it deserves, is the Cotton MS. in the British

Museum, Vespasian A. I., a Latin Psalter of the seventh century, with an interlineary Anglo-Saxon gloss, apparently of the ninth century, or possibly still earlier. A short comparison of this gloss with the Psalter published by Spelman, or any other of the ordinary West-Saxon texts, will show that it differs from them considerably in orthography, in grammatical forms, and, not unfrequently, in its vocabulary also. In short, it is not West-Saxon, but belonging to the Anglian class of dialects; and its general correspondence with other known monuments, to be noticed hereafter, renders it highly probable that it emanated either from Northumbria or some adjoining locality. A regular specification of all its peculiarities would occupy too much space, and would require a fuller examination of the MS. than it has hitherto received. Occasionally too the MS. fluctuates between common West-Saxon and Anglian forms; but the latter have such a preponderance as to give a decided character to the text. Among orthographical peculiarities, the most prominent is the regular substitution of *oe* for the broad *e* of the West-Saxon, corresponding to *uo* in Old High-German and the accented *ó*, and occasionally *ae* in Icelandic: e. gr.

boen, *prayer*;	West-Saxon,	bén.
boec, *books*;	,,	béc.
coelan, *to cool*;	,,	célan.
doeman, *to judge*;	,,	déman.
foedan, *to feed*;	,,	fédan.
spoed, *fortune*;	,,	spéd.
swoet, *sweet*;	,,	swét.
woenan, *to think*;	,,	wénan.

The analogy of the cognate dialects shows that the Anglian is the more original form.

Other variations in vowels and diphthongs, though pretty frequent, are not so constant as the above. There is a general tendency to substitute simple sounds for complex ones: e. gr. *a* for the West-Saxon *ea*: *all*, omnis, W.-S. *eall*: *e* for *æ*: *deg*, day, W.-S. *dæg*; *fet*, vessel, W.-S. *fæt*: also for *eo*: *leht*, light, W.-S. *leoht*: occasionally *o* for *u*: *thorh*, through, W.-S. *thorh*. A thorough examination of the MS. might perhaps enable us to discover and classify other peculiar forms.

The grammatical inflexions also present noticeable variations from the ordinary type. The plural of feminine nouns in the sixth form of Rask commonly ends in *e*: *theode*, populi, W.-S. *theoda*. Feminines in *u* preserve that vowel throughout the singular: e. gr. *gifu*, gift; gen. dat. acc. *gifu*, instead of W.-S. *gife*. The same vowel occurs in many adjectives and participles feminine, where the ordinary dialect has more frequently *e*: as micel*u*, magna, W.-S. mycle. In the personal pronouns, the accusatives *mec*, *thec*, *usic*, *eowic*, answering to the German *mich*, *dich*, *euch*, are of regular occurrence. In the demonstrative pronoun or article, the nom. fem. is generally *sie* instead of *seo*, and in the oblique cases *e* takes place of *æ*: e. gr. gen. *thes*, *there*, W.-S. *thæs*, *thære*. The dative masc. and neut. in both numbers is uniformly *thæm*, a form deserving of notice for its correspondence with the Mæso-Gothic *thaim*. Passing over a number of other minute variations in nouns and pronouns, we may observe that the most marked characteristic of the dialect appears in the first person singular of the present indicative of regular verbs, which uniformly terminates in *u* or *o*, presenting a close analogy to the Old Saxon and Lithuanian, but long obsolete in the West-Saxon. Thus *getreowu*, I believe; *cleopiu*, I call; *sellu*, I give; *ondredu*, I fear; *sitto*, I sit; *drinco*, I drink; *ageldu*, I pay or yield, where a later hand has added l'. [vel] *offrige*; *getimbru*, instruam; gloss *a secunda manu*, l'. *laere*; according to the ordinary dialect. The second person generally ends in *s* instead of *st*, both in the present and imperfect: *neosas*, thou visitest; *acerres*, thou turnest away; *gesettes*, thou placest; *lufedes*, thou lovedst; *gewonades*, thou diminishedst; *neasades*, thou visitedst; *smiredes*, thou didst anoint; where it will be observed that *edes* or *ades* is substituted for the ordinary ending of the second person imperf. *odest*. The third pers. pl. imperf. also frequently ends in *un*—*fuledun*, they became corrupt, W.-S. *fulodon*,—another point of agreement with the Old-Saxon. The verb substantive has also several peculiarities, the most remarkable of which is the plural of the present indicative *earun* (sumus, estis, sunt), the original of the English *are*, but totally unknown in West-Saxon. Another important characteristic of the dialect is the frequent omission of the prefix *ge* in past participles: *hered*, praised, W.-S. *geherod*; *bledsad*, blessed, W.-S. *gebletsod*; *soht*, sought, W.-S. *gesoht*; thus approximating in some degree to the Norse tongues. The importance of this characteristic will appear when we come to classify the more recent dialects.

The documents which we have next to consider belong to a period when lapse of time and external causes appear to have affected in some degree the purity of the dialect; but, in recompense, we have the advantage of knowing pretty accurately to what locality and what age they are to be referred. We here allude to the gloss of the celebrated Durham Gospels (Cotton MS. Nero, D. 4.), and that of the 'Rituale Ecclesiæ Dunelmensis,' lately edited for the Surtees Society by Mr. Stevenson. A chronological note in the latter document fixes the date of a portion of the MS. in A.D. 970, and the identity of the dialect, and it is also believed of the handwriting in both, conspire with all the external evidence which we possess, to induce us to refer the whole Anglo-Saxon portion to Durham or its vicinity, in the tenth century. These texts agree with that of the Psalter in the general cast of the orthography: e. gr. in substituting *a* for the West-Saxon *ea*: *all*, omnis; *arm*, brachium: *e* for *æ*: *feger*, pulcher; and for *eo*: *leht*, lumen: *oe* for *é*: *doema*, judicare. On the other hand, there are various peculiarities sufficient to give a distinct character to the text; one of the most remarkable of which is the frequent substitution of *i* for *e* both in simple syllables and diphthongs: *gilef* for *gelef*, *mægi* for *mæge*, *thiostrum* for *theostrum*, *hiara* for *heara* [W.-S. *heora*], *iwer* for *eower*. The differences in grammatical forms may be attributed partly to the effect of time and partly to extraneous influences. In the first person of verbs, *o* is much more frequent than *u*: *fehto,* pugno; *beto,* castigo; *wuldrigo,* glorior. The plural ð is commonly softened down to *s*: *biddas,* precamur; *giwoedes,* induite; *wyrcas,* facite. The final *n* is generally dropped in infinitives: *gimersiga,* celebrare; *cuoetha,* dicere; *inngeonga,* intrare. The oblique cases and plurals of weak nouns (Rask's 1st class) drop the final *n* in all genders: *hearta,* corda; *earthe* (dat.), terrâ; *nome* (W.-S. naman), nominis; and not unfrequently *an* is converted into *o* or *u*: *ego,* oculi; *witgo* and *witgu,* prophetæ (gen. sing. and nom. plur.). The last two peculiarities approximate to the Icelandic, which also drops the final *n,* and as they do not occur in the older text of the Psalter, they may possibly be the results of an intermixture with the Northmen. The writer has not met with purely Scandinavian *words,* either in the Gospels or the Ritual; but a friend, well-acquainted with the former MS., informs him that *by,* a town or village, and *at,* the prefix to the Norse infinitive, occur once or twice. It is proper to observe that two of the above supposed indications of a more recent age also occur on the Ruthwell Cross, namely the infinitive in *a*: *halda* for *hyldan* or *healdjan*; and the termination of weak nouns in *u* for *an*: *an galgu* for *on gealgan.* If therefore this monument is to be referred to the ante-Danish period, which the history of the district would rather incline us to suppose, those peculiarities, and perhaps some others, must be considered as belonging to this particular subdivision of the dialect. Possibly the Ruthwell and Durham texts may be Northumbrian, in the strict sense of the word, and the Psalter, Anglian or Mercian.

The last considerable text of this class is the gloss to the Bodleian MS., commonly called the Rushworth Gospels, respecting the locality of which we can form at least a probable presumption. The gloss was the work of two scribes, Owen and Farmenn, the latter of whom describes himself as priest at *Harawuda* or Harewood. The only Harewood specified in the Domesday survey is the well-known place of that name in Wharfdale in Yorkshire; and the analogy of the dialect to that of the Durham texts enables us to fix the origin of it with tolerable certainty in a northern county, as likely York as any other. Wanley, who was a good judge of the age of MSS., refers the Saxon portion of it to the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century. It appears indeed, from the grammatical forms, to be somewhat older than the Durham Gospels, but in all material points the dialect is the same. A connected specimen, in which the discrepancies from the ordinary West-Saxon are specified, will show the nature of the text more satisfactorily than the enumeration of isolated words. It is observable that the earlier portion of the gloss, executed by Farmenn, approximates in several points to the ordinary dialect, where that of his coadjutor Owen agrees closely with the Durham texts. For example, in the Gospel of St. Matthew, the present indicative commonly ends in *e* and the infinitive in *an*: *sprece,* loquor; *sprecan,* loqui. Phenomena of this kind may be attributed to the political and literary preponderance of the West-Saxon branch in the ninth and tenth centuries.

The result of the foregoing investigation is, that there exists a class of documents exhibiting a marked difference in orthography and grammatical forms from the ordinary West-Saxon tongue. Two of these, the Durham Gospels and the Ritual, may be referred with certainty to the heart of Northumbria; and another with great probability to the West Riding of Yorkshire, in a locality where, at this day, a river forms the boundary between the Northumbrian and North-Anglian dialects. The remaining one, the Cotton Psalter, cannot with certainty be proved to be of Northumbrian origin, geographically speaking; but the general agreement of its forms with those of the other monuments enables us to pronounce with tolerable confidence, that it belongs to that Anglian division of which the Northumbrian was a branch. It is moreover the oldest and purest considerable specimen of that class, and therefore occupies an important place among the Teutonic dialects, to the general grammar and analogies of which it affords many valuable illustrations. It is hardly necessary to say that all the documents of which we have been treating are of the highest importance for the study and elucidation of our vernacular dialects; and we may be allowed to express a hope that they will ere long be rendered more* available to the public than they have hitherto been.

Our Lord's dialogue with the woman of Samaria is given as a specimen of the Rushworth text, from which it will be seen to agree more generally with the Durham monuments than with the Psalter. A comparison of the corresponding passage from the Hatton Gospels will show that the latter text, though upwards of two centuries later, preserves, with but slight deviations, the grammatical forms of the West-Saxon; thus proving that the leading peculiarities of the glosses are inherent in the dialect, and not the corruptions of a more recent period.

John iv. 1—26. Want of access to the Rushworth and Hatton MSS. has made it necessary to trust to a transcript, occasionally, it is feared, of doubtful accuracy. The Hatton text is that of the ordinary Anglo-Saxon Gospels, with slight verbal and orthographical variations. The Rushworth gloss, like all others of the same character, adheres servilely to the order and phraseology of the Latin, of which it frequently mistakes the true sense. Consequently it is totally subversive of the vernacular idiom, and is chiefly valuable for its grammatical forms.

RUSHWORTH GOSPELS.	HATTON GOSPELS.
JOHN, chap. iv.	JOHN, chap. iv.
Thæt forthon [the hælend] ongætt [thætte] *gi*herdon tha *alde* wearas thætte *the* hæl[end] monige thegnas wyrceth and *fulwath* thonne Ioh'[annes]: *theh* the, I' swa he, *the* hæl' ne *fulwade* ah thegnas his: forleort Judeam *eortho* and *foerde* efter sona	Tha se hælend wiste thæt tha Pharisei ge hyrden thæt he hæfde ema [ma] leorning-cnihta thonne Johannes: theah se hælend ne fullode ac hys leorning-cnihtas: Tha forlet he Judea land and for eft on Galilea. hym gebyrede thæthe scolde

---

* The writer may be allowed to state that the Psalter is now printing for the Surtees Society, under the superintendence of the Rev. Joseph Stevenson.

in Galileam. wæs *gi* dæfendlic wutudl'[ice] hine thætte of'[er] *foerde therh* tha burig [Samaria]. com forthon in tha cæstre Samar', *thio* is *gi*cweden Sichar, neh *thær byrig* thætte *salde* Jacob Josepes suno his wæs wutudl' ther wælla Jacobes. The hæl' forthon *woerig* wæs of gonge, sitende wæs, l' sat, swa ofer thæm *wælla*: tid wæs swelce *thio* sexta. wif [com] of *thær byrig* to hladanne thæt wæter, cwæth him *the* hæl'; *sel* me *drinca*. thegnas wutudl'. *foerdun* in cæstre thætte mete *bohtun* him. cwæth f'thon to him thæt wif *thio* Samaritanesca, hu thu Judesc mith thy *arth* drincende from me *giowes* tu tha the mith thy wif's [sie?] Samaritanesc? ne for thon *gi*byrelic bith Judea to Samaritaniscum. *gi*ondswarade *the* hæl' and cwæth him, gif thu *wistes* hus [*domum*, Lat.] Godes and hwelc were se the cwæth the *sel* me *drinca* thu wutudl'. l' woenis mara, gif thu *georwades* [giowades?] from him and [he] *gisalde* the wæter cwic welle. cwæth to him thæt wif, driht[en] ne m [in?] hwon tha hlado hæfest thu, and the pytt neh is: hwona, l' hwer, forthon hæfest thu wæter cwic welle? ah ne *arthu* mara feder usum Jacobe sethe *salde* us *thiosne* pytt, l' *wælla*, and he of him dranc and suno his and feothor fota, l' neæno [netenu], his? *gi*ondsworade the hæl' and cwæth, eghwelc sethe drinceth of wætre this [*thæt ic *seld*] [selo?] in ecnisse; sethe wutudl' drinceth of wætre thæt ic seld him ne thyrstæ in ecnisse. ah wæter thæt ic *seld* him bith in *thæm* wælla wætres *saltes* in life ecum. cwæth him thæt wif, drih' sel me this wæter thæt ic ne thyrste, ne ic ne *cymo* hider to hladanne, l' to fyllanne. cwæth him *the* h'[ælend], ceig were thinum and cym hither. ondsworade thæt wif and cwæth him ne *hafo* ic wer. cwæth to hir *the* hæl' wel thu cwede thætte ic ne *hafo* wer. fife forthon weoras thu *hæfdes* and nu thonne *hæfes* ne is thin wer. this sothlice thu cwede. cwæth him thæt wif drih' ic *gisiom* forthon *witgu arth* thy [thu]. fædres ures on more thissum *gi*worthadun and gie *cweothas* thætte

faran thurh Samaria land. witelice he com on Samarian cestre the ys genemned Sichar neah tham tune the Jacob sealde Josepe his sune. thær wæs Jacobes wylle. se hælend sæt æt tham welle, tha he wæs werige gan: and hyt wæs mid-dayg. tha com thær an wif of Samaria wolde water feccan. Tha cwæth se hælend to hyre, gyf me drincan. hys leorning-cnihtes ferdon tha to thare ceastre woldon heom mete beggen. Tha cwæth thæt Samaritanisse wif to hym, hu mete bydst thu at me drinken thonne thu ert Judeisc and ic em Samaritanisc wyf? ne brucath Judeas and Samaritanisce metes ætgadere. Tha answerede se hælend and cwæth to hyre, gif thu wistes Godes gyfe and hwæt se ys he cwæth to the, sele me drinken, witodlice thu bede hyne thæt he sealde the lyfes wæter. tha cwæth thæt wif to hym, leofne, thu nafst nan thing mid to hladene, and thes pett ys deop: hwanen hafst thu lyfes wæter? cwest thu thæt thu mare sy thonne ure fader Jacob se the us thisne pyt sealde, and he and hys bearn and hys nytanu of tham druncan? Tha andswerede se hæl' and cwæth to hyre, ælc thare therst eft the of thisse wætere drinketh; witodlice ælc thare the drincth of tham watere the ic hym sylle beoth on him wylla forth færendes wæteres on ece lyf. tha cwæth thæt wif to him, hlaford sele me thæt me ne therste, ne ic ne thurfe her water fecchan. tha cwæth sa [se] halend to hyre, ga and clype thinne cheorl and cum hider. tha hym answerede thus thæt wif and cwæth, nabbe ic nænne cheorl. tha cwæth se halend to hyre, wel thu cwethe thæt thu næfst ceorl. witodlice thu hafst fif cheorles, and se the thu nu hafst nis thin ceorl: æt tham thu segdest soth. Tha cwæth thæt wif to hym, leof, thas me thincth thu ert witega. ure faderes hyo gebeden on thissene dune and ge secgeth thæt on Jerusalem syo stow the thæt man on gebydde. Tha cwæth se halend to hyre; la wif, gelef me thæt seo tid cymth thonne ge ne biddeth tham fader ne on thisse dune ne on Jerusalem. ge

---

* A blunder for *thyrsteth*.

in- hierus'[alem] is *thio* stow ther *gi*worthade ge *gi*dæfnath is. cwæth hire the hæl' la wif *gi*lef me forthon com *thio* tid thonne ne on morum thissum ne in hierusal' to worth*adun* thone fæder. gie *werthigas* thætte we [gie] ne *wutun*. we wordigath thætte we *wutun* we; thætte f'thon hælo of Judeum. ah com *thio* tid and nu is thone sothlice weorthigas ge-worthadun thon̄ fæder in gaste and mith sothfæst' [nisse]. f'thon and the fæder hiæ *soeceth thuslico* f'thon geworthigas hine. in gaste and sothfæstnisse us *gi*dæfnath to worthanne. cwæth to him thæt wif, ic wat thætte the *gi*corna com * * * * * *gi*sægeth *alle*. cwæth hir the hæl' ic *am* sethe ic *spreco thec* mith.

gebiddeth thæt ge nyten. we gebiddeth thæt we witon; for tham the hale is of Judeum. ac seo tid cymth and nu ys thonne sothe ge-bedmen biddeth thonne father on gaste and on sothfæstnysse. witodlice se fader secth swilce the hyne gebiddeth. gast ys God and tham the hine biddeth gebyreth thæt hyo gebidden on gaste and on sothfæstnysse. Thæt wif cwæth to him, ic wat thæt Messias cymth, thæt ys ge-nemned Crist, thonne he cymth he cyth us ealle thing. se hælend cwæth to hyre, ic hyt em the with the sprece.

2. "Suggestions on the Critical Arrangement of the Text of the Medea." By the Rev. O. Cockayne.

In the critical arrangement of the text of the Medea, not much has been done since Porson, Elmsley, and Hermann's review, a period of some thirty years. New editions have appeared, but they consist chiefly in delivering verdicts upon the old suggestions, and drawing us back to the testimony of the manuscripts. The vigorous and instructive speculations of those former days are examined but not imitated, and instead of presenting the reader with new matter for reflection, the page is occupied with what need not have been said at all, or what, biassed by self-love and negligence, is not well said. To give an example of error arising from superficial views, let us take lines 317, 318:—

λέγεις ἀκοῦσαι μαλθάκ', ἀλλ' εἴσω φρενῶν
ὀῤῥωδία μοι, μή τι βουλεύσῃς κακόν.

This is the reading of the MSS. and is a correct reading, but Elmsley has invented, Hermann ratified, and others have followed a new reading, βουλεύῃς, in the present tense. When we say μὴ βουλεύσῃς, we say in an aorist or indefinite way, *lest you plan*; on the other hand, μὴ βουλεύῃς, in the present, signifies *lest you be planning*. The distinction has been long since worked out, and amounts to this: the one marks a plan of which no more is said; the other speaks of a plan, and tells us it is as yet incomplete and still in progress. It was on similar grounds that Elmsley based his conjecture, which was in a high degree plausible and attractive. Creon says to Medea, λέγεις ἀκοῦσαι μαλθακὰ, *you speak smooth words, but, it misgives me, you are all the while plotting mischief*. That seems a very fit and suitable mode of expression, and if that was what the poet meant to say, he must of necessity have used the present βουλεύῃς, as Elmsley says. But the conjecture, though plausible, is not valid; the manuscript reading has a different sense and quite as good a one, which will appear as soon as we recall attention to some words that have been forgotten. Creon, when he took the resolution of sending Medea out of Corinth, had been influenced by a fear of her schemes of revenge, and so he says, verse 282,

> *δέδοικά σ', οὐδὲν δεῖ παραμπίσχειν λόγους,*
> *μή μοί τι δράσῃς παῖδ' ἀνήκεστον κακόν;*

and in the lines now considered, he declares that this former dread remains unshaken by her pleading; it still lives *εἴσω φρενῶν*, deep-rooted in his heart. And those words, *εἴσω φρενῶν*, are emphatic; they imply that his distrust is there, notwithstanding all efforts to remove it, and in despite of the smooth words she bestows. Consequently the idea of duration, expressible by "whilst," does not enter into the sentence, and the present tense is improper. Elmsley himself has noticed *δέδοικα δ' αὐτὴν μή τι βουλεύσῃ νέον*, but very justly, in his view of the passage, denied the parallel. As the interpretation is now given, however, the parallel stands good. Whether the words *εἴσω φρενῶν* are always emphatic we need not inquire, but they are so in Philoctet. 1309:—

> *καὶ ταῦτ' ἐπίστω καὶ γράφου φρενῶν ἔσω.*

There is a single word *ἐγήματο*, in line 264,

> *τὸν δόντα τ' αὐτῷ θυγατέρ', ἣν τ' ἐγήματο,*

which has surprised every one, and elicited from Hermann an explanation that is certainly very unsatisfactory. Few seem willing to alter the pronoun *ἣν*, because an error in that word would be obvious to every correcting hand; but it may perhaps be permitted us to conjecture that the original word was *ἐγείνατο*, and that the great similarity of the characters led to a corruption of the text. Here is an instance in which a known and flagrant solecism will probably maintain its place in future editions, simply because it is too bad to be charged on the copyists. Its defenders may say, *solœcismum liceat fecisse poetæ*; to which it may be replied, that there was no pressure either of metre, diction, or tumultuous passion to call for such a breach of common phraseology; and it may be laid down for an axiom, that Euripides would not commit a solecism without *some* reason. Nor can sarcasm have place, for that owes its sting to certain preconceptions of the hearers, and in this case there has been nothing to suggest that Jason was too submissive to his new wife, or to provide beforehand a right apprehension of the concealed gibe. Illustration is not the object of this paper, but we may be permitted to quote one to our purpose from Dio's account of the emperor Elagabalus:—*καὶ περὶ τῶν γάμων αὐτοῦ ὧν τε ἐγάμει, ὧν τε ἐγήματο, αὐτίκα λελέξεται· καὶ γὰρ ἠνδρίζετο καὶ ἐθηλύνετο.*—Dio, lxxix. 5.

While on this topic of the trustworthiness of the manuscripts, we may record our regret that no editor has ventured to make room in the text for the emendation of Elmsley on 1086:—

> *παῦρον δὲ γένος, [μίαν] ἐν πολλαῖς*
> *εὕροις ἂν ἴσως*
> *οὐκ ἀπόμουσον τὸ γυναικῶν.*

Let us proceed to examine in their order some parts of the play which seem to offer scope to correction.

At line 216 is a passage that well deserves our attention. It has been a stumbling-block to the critics, but they have managed to get over it by assigning to the words a signification they do not, and never could possess. The lines are given as they stand in the books:—

> *Κορινθίαι γυναῖκες, ἐξῆλθον δόμων*
> *μή μοί τι μέμφησθ'· οἶδα γὰρ πολλοὺς βροτῶν*
> *σεμνοὺς γεγῶτας, τοὺς μὲν ὀμμάτων ἄπο,*
> *τοὺς δ' ἐν θυραίοις· οἱ δ' ἀφ' ἡσύχου ποδὸς*
> *δύσκλειαν ἐκτήσαντο καὶ ῥᾳθυμίαν.*
> *δίκη γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστιν ὀφθαλμοῖς βροτῶν,*
> *ὅστις, πρὶν ἀνδρὸς σπλάγχνον ἐκμαθεῖν σαφῶς,*
> *στυγεῖ δεδορκὼς, οὐδὲν ἠδικημένος.*
> *χρὴ δὲ ξένον μὲν κάρτα προσχωρεῖν πόλει,*
> *οὐδ' ἀστὸν ἤνεσ', ὅστις αὐθάδης γεγὼς*
> *πικρὸς πολίταις ἐστὶν ἀμαθίας ὕπο.*

It would give rise to nothing but confusion, were we to examine into the methods proposed for accommodating some intelligible meaning to these lines and to point out the fallacies: it is better to say at once, that there is no connected sense whatever. The most formidable circumstance is that Ennius, in a play of his, has imitated the thoughts, and his authority is one that deserves deference. The parts of his drama that present themselves here have been preserved by Cicero in a letter to Trebatius, and they contain a set of ideas which do not belong to the words of Euripides, and which are altogether foreign to the subject he treats of. If this be capable of proof, we shall not allow ourselves to be led astray by a parallel, but not identical place, of the Latin poet, leaving it rather for inquiry how it came to pass that he should differ from his Greek model. The deviations in such lines of the whole play as exist, are so numerous that some critics have thought Ennius wrote two Medeas, and some that Euripides had done so. But even from that single letter to Trebatius, it is plain that in the passage before us, Ennius was not servilely discharging the office of translator, but only using for his own purposes the rhetoric of his predecessor. One of the lines given by Cicero is this—*Multi suam rem bene gessere et publicam patria procul.* This sense it is contended could never have entered into the meaning of Euripides, as it is wholly irrelevant. The poet is assigning a cause for the compliance of Medea in appearing at all in public instead of nursing her indignation within; and she says, *ἐξῆλθον δόμων μή μοί τι μέμφησθε*; and goes on to speak of the respect due to public opinion, and the danger of setting it at defiance. How then could she introduce any mention of a successful foreign policy? The topic might be available to Ennius, but it could have no significancy to Euripides. The corresponding Greek is this: *οἶδα γὰρ πολλοὺς βροτῶν Σεμνοὺς γεγῶτας, τοὺς μὲν ὀμμάτων ἄπο.* The meaning of these expressions must be arrived at by looking at the words themselves, and at the bearing of the whole train of thought.

Medea is talking of accessibility, and that idea is the staple of the whole. What reference then to accessibility do we find in *οἱ μὲν ὀμμάτων ἄπο*? Plainly the negation and reverse—retired habits. Surely if Ennius thought that *patria procul* were conveyed here, the copies he used must have been corrupted in the same way as our own. Let us then take for proved, by the connexion of the sentence, that *ὀμμάτων ἄπο* implies privacy and retirement; if so, it follows necessarily that *ἐν θυραίοις* must designate the other sort, the men of public life. This latter phrase might, in a different association, be equivalent to *patria procul*, but in this place it cannot be so, because that notion is not in anywise germane to the rest. Ennius says: *Multi suam rem bene gessere et publicam patria procul; multi qui domi ætatem agerent propterea sunt improbati.* Here the topics are active service abroad and indolence at home, and what have those things to do with Medea, who is speaking of her willingness to hold converse with the Chorus, and her reasons for this compliance? It seems therefore clear, that the words of the Latin poet are not a translation of the Greek.

Take next for a moment the word *σεμνοὺς*, and notice how it connects itself with the general current of thought. Medea was a haughty and self-willed character, and here the poet introduces her, with a sort of reluctance, apologizing to her own consistency for the condescension of appearing at all, and longing all the while to defy mankind and to involve herself in her own *σεμνότης*. The link then that binds this word to the rest is, that to remain within would bear an aspect of greater dignity.

Photius here takes *σεμνὸς*, not for *ἀξιωματικὸς*, but for *ὑπερήφανος*: but it must contain a sense to which approbation may be applied, because of the opposition to *δύσκλειαν*.

The next phrase that occurs is *οἱ ἀφ' ἡσύχου ποδὸς*, and here too we must keep up the main thread of the discourse and expect some reference to accessibility. It is obvious then, that *men of easy access* are hereby signified, and to them no share of *σεμνότης* is allotted: their familiar manners are regarded with contempt, *δύσκλειαν ἐκτήσαντο καὶ ῥᾳθυμίαν*. If there were any doubt, the explanation now given might be supported by a passage of the Hippolytus, in which the same association and contrast occur, though with a different distribution. Hippol. 90:—

A. *οἶσθ' οὖν βροτοῖσιν ὃς καθέστηκεν νόμος;*
B. *οὐκ οἶδα· τοῦ δὲ καί μ' ἀνιστορεῖς πέρι;*
A. *μισεῖν τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ τὸ μὴ πᾶσιν φίλον.*
B. *ὀρθῶς γε· τίς δ' οὐ σεμνὸς ἀχθεινὸς βροτῶν;*
A. *ἐν δ' εὐπροσηγόροισιν ἔστι τις χάρις;*
B. *πλείστη γε, καὶ κέρδος γε σὺν μόχθῳ βραχεῖ.*

Here the progress of the thoughts being somewhat different, the poet has put the *εὐπροσήγοροι*, or *affable*, for *οἱ ἀφ' ἡσύχου ποδὸς, the accessible*; but they are a closely kindred genus, and either passage may throw light upon the other.

The sense then appears to be in some degree ascertained: the *σεμνοὶ* are the awful and venerated, those *ὀμμάτων ἄπο* are the retired and unseen, the *θυραῖοι* are such as lived in the busy world, and *οἱ ἀφ' ἡσύχου ποδὸς* are the facile and familiar. In building up grounds for a conjectural emendation it would not be prudent to neglect anything that can strengthen the argument; we may therefore notice that much the same remark has been made by another Greek writer: Isocrates ad Nicoclem, p. 21. § 34. *εὑρήσεις ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τοὺς μὲν σεμνυνομένους ψυχροὺς ὄντας, τοὺς δὲ βουλομένους ἀστείους εἶναι ταπεινοὺς φαινομένους*: where *ταπεινοὺς* corresponds with *δύσκλειαν* in the poet, and the *ἀστεῖοι* or urbane are much the same with *οἱ ἀφ' ἡσύχου ποδός.*

Now if we take the ideas that we have thus collected and place them in juxtaposition, we come upon the chief difficulty of the passage. Medea tells the chorus she would not incur censure by reserve, and yet attaches to this same reserve, under the name of *σεμνότης*, the homage of the people, and applies censure to the accessibility which rules her own conduct. To remedy this contradiction, we would venture to amend the present reading by a transposition, which we shall endeavour to defend by additional arguments; and this being done, a new protasis and apodosis will furnish the means of removing the difficulty and of restoring evenness and sense to the context. The order in which it is proposed to read the lines is as follows:—

> *Κορινθίαι γυναῖκες, ἐξῆλθον δόμων*
> *μή μοί τι μέμφησθ'· οἶδα γὰρ πολλοὺς βροτῶν*
> *σεμνοὺς γεγῶτας, τοὺς μὲν ὀμμάτων ἄπο,*
> *τοὺς δ' ἐν θυραίοις· οἱ δ' ἀφ' ἡσύχου ποδὸς*
> *δύσκλειαν ἐκτήσαντο καὶ ῥᾳθυμίαν.*
> *χρὴ δὲ ξένον μὲν κάρτα προσχωρεῖν πόλει,*
> *οὐδ' ἀστὸν ἤνεσ', ὅστις αὐθάδης γεγὼς*
> *πικρὸς πολίταις ἐστὶν ἀμαθίας ὕπο.*
> *δίκη γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστιν ὀφθαλμοῖς βροτῶν,*
> *ὅστις, πρὶν ἀνδρὸς σπλάγχνον ἐκμαθεῖν σαφῶς,*
> *στυγεῖ δεδορκὼς, οὐδὲν ἠδικημένος.*

If the lines be read in this order, *χρὴ δὲ ξένον* is the apodosis to *οἶδα [μὲν] πολλοὺς σεμνούς·* and Medea uses such language as this: *I am come forth to avoid censure: for while I know that reserve is often more calculated to secure respect than is complaisance, yet my situation as a foreigner imposes on me compliance with the wishes of the people among whom I live.* This contrast is fully conveyed in the words *οἶδα [μὲν]*, *on the one hand I know*, and *χρὴ δὲ*, *but on the other hand it is the duty*, and if *μὲν* had been expressed, it is probable that the sentence could never have become obscure. Though perhaps unnecessary, it cannot be quite useless to cite a similar sentiment from Eur. Supplices, 893:—

> *πρῶτον μὲν ὡς χρὴ τοὺς μετοικοῦντας ξένους,*
> *λυπηρὸς οὐκ ἦν, οὐδ' ἐπίφθονος πόλει.*

That transpositions of lines have often occurred in the dramas of the ancients as handed down to us, will probably be admitted; but since the device, considered as a sanative process, is far from ingenious, and does by no means recommend itself to our approbation at first sight, it may be desirable to pursue our investigation of the text before us somewhat further. In the words *δίκη γὰρ οὐκ ἔνεστιν*, the connecting particle marks beyond dispute or mistake that there exists a reference to what precedes: a reason is rendered for something said previously. But as the lines stand in the editions and manuscripts, no one has satisfactorily shown, how and whereby this retrospective relation subsists: on the contrary, if, as now suggested, we restore the order, we not only see the difficulties vanish in the lines already considered, but there arises also a natural and easy transition and a perfect connexion of thought between *πικρὸς πολίταις* in the former member and *στυγεῖ δεδορκὼς* in the latter, between *ἀμαθίας ὕπο* in the one and *πρὶν ἐκμαθεῖν σαφῶς* in the other. So that the transposition has cured a twofold disruption.

It would detract from the interest of the passage, and would impair the support which the present interpretation and emendation receive from parallel places, (for the Hippolytus at least dates nearly with the Medea,) if we were to pass over its historical aspect. The favourite imagery, the frequently recurring sentiments of a poet, may often be traced to the facts of his private life, the events that most nearly touched him: and this is more especially true of minds in which the range of fancy is but circumscribed, as was the case with Euripides. If we remember that this play was acted in the spring of 431 B.C., a few months after the trial of Anaxagoras and Aspasia, the friends and intimates of Pericles, we may conceive it probable that these circumstances suggested the reflection. That a foreigner should in prudence accommodate himself to the prejudices of his adopted countrymen would be an observation arising naturally out of the banishment of Anaxagoras, and the gentler censure applied to a native may be supposed to glance at Pericles. These persons were no less remarkable for their personal characteristics than for their position as statesman and philosopher. Neither of them ever relaxed into laughter, and Pericles was very singularly reserved in his ordinary habits, careful to retain an evenness of exterior, and self-possessed amid the tumults of the popular assembly. Plutarch is very particular in describing these minuter points, and he gives us a reproof addressed by Zeno of Velia to some who carped at this high bearing of the minister: to make pretension to lofty things has an effect, said he, towards elevating the soul itself.

529. A passage which has been pretty much neglected by the commentators stands thus:—

> *σοὶ δ' ἔστι μὲν νοῦς λεπτὸς, ἀλλ' ἐπίφθονος*
> *λόγος διελθεῖν, ὡς Ἔρως σ' ἠνάγκασε*
> *τόξοις ἀφύκτοις τοὐμὸν ἐκσῶσαι δέμας.*
> *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸ θήσομαι λίαν.*

The grammatical construction here seems to labour under serious embarrassment. A difficulty had been seen by the Scholiast, who proposes several different explanations. Musgrave's Latin is as follows: *Tibi vero—Est quidem locus subtilis sed invidiosus oratione* *tractari, quod amor te coegerit sagittis inevitabilibus meum eripere corpus.* With this may be compared a suggestion of the Scholiast: *ἐμὸς λόγος, φησὶ, λεπτὸς μὲν, ἐπίφθονος δέ. τουτέστι φθονηθησόμενος μὲν, δυνάμενος δὲ διαδύεσθαι παντὸς τοῦ ἰσχνοῦ.* It is no very easy matter to understand these interpretations. As far as appears, *locus* is the translation of *νοῦς*, perhaps in the sense of *topic*: and Musgrave points, *σοὶ δ', ἔστι μὲν νοῦς λεπτὸς*, while notwithstanding *ἔστι* seems to be no more than a copula, with *λεπτὸς* for a predicate: and what becomes of *σοί?* On the other hand, the Scholiast reverses the position of the two members of the sentence, and gets, as far as we can see, no tolerable sense after all; for would Jason say he was using a wire-drawn argument? A recent German editor has translated more plausibly—*Tibi quidem subtilis mens est, ut intelligere hoc atque agnoscere facile possis, sed tamen invidiæ plena oratio est, si ipse explico te amore motam esse, ut me servares.* Here we have two good reasons from Jason for hinting only at the subject in hand: first, Medea is an acute person and can readily understand him; and, second, to do more than hint would be ungracious in the speaker. The connecting particle between these two very compatible and unconflicting motives should be *καὶ*, and so the Scholiast with equal candour and boldness suggests: *δύναται δὲ καὶ οὕτως νοηθῆναι*, KAI *ἐπίφθονος ὁ λόγος ῥηθῆναι.* Notwithstanding all this, the connecting word in Euripides is *ἀλλὰ*, a very unfit and improper mode of joining two concurrent reasons for one thing. If we had found *οὔκουν ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸ θήσομαι λίαν*; or if that line were eliminated; or if we had something to mark an *oratio abrupta* with a sudden transition: thus—

σοὶ δ' ἔστι μὲν νοῦς λεπτὸς, ἀλλ'—

or if we could suppose the same thing reiterated, with *ἀλλὰ* twice, there would be less difficulty. A little negligence or boldness in the author might be sufficient to produce what we now read, and then we should suppose the break to take place after

σοὶ δ' ἔστι μὲν νοῦς λεπτός—

for although for the most part some few words expressed give an indication of what was going to follow, as "Quos ego— sed præstat motos componere fluctus," yet in this case the dropped clause is nearly contained in the words *Ἔρως σ' ἠνάγκασε*, and no further intimation is required. This explanation however is not satisfactory, by reason of the awkward repetition of *ἀλλὰ* with equivalent clauses.

Verse 733. *Τούτοις δ' ὁρκίοισι μὲν ζυγεὶς*
ἄγουσιν οὐ μεθεῖ' ἂν ἐκ γαίας ἐμέ·
λόγοις δὲ συμβὰς καὶ θεῶν ἀνώμοτος
φίλος γένοι' ἂν κἀπικηρυκεύμασιν
οὐκ ἂν πίθοιο.

Rejecting the reading *μεθεὶς ἂν* as a singularity in form backed by no necessity, and assuming as a matter of course *ἀνώμοτος* to the exclusion of *ἐνώμοτος*, such appears to be the text of the manuscripts that have come down to us. But since *ἐπικηρυκεύματα* are diplomatic messages sent in all form by a *κήρυξ*, the critics have by degrees arrived at the correction *τάχ' ἂν πίθοιο*, which, putting an affirmative in place of a negative, introduces the sense required by doing a mere violence to the text. It appears however from the Scholiast, that in the age of Didymus the copies had *κἀπικηρυκεύματα* (*τῇ δὲ εὐθείᾳ ἀντὶ δοτικῆς κέχρηται*), a reading which, from the very embarrassment it afforded, must have had its origin in the copies and not in the emendations of the grammarians. The restoration of this ancient and attested form would overthrow anew the equilibrium imposed upon the text, and it is plain that the scholars of the age of Augustus read *κἀπικηρυκεύματα οὐκ*, where Porson, by a twofold deviation, has printed *κἀπικηρυκεύμασιν τάχ'*.

It may without hesitation be assumed as a canon of reasonable criticism, that an hypothesis which leaves old and difficult readings as they stood, is to be embraced rather than alterations which restore sense to the text, while they bid defiance to the testimony of manuscript or grammatical tradition. The change of case and removal of the negation are means of so little ingenuity and so much coercion, that we may be allowed to offer a solution in which the case shall remain and the negation shall stand, and yet a suitable signification be restored to the passage, and this we think may be done by imagining a line to have been lost. In place of the missing words, we may insert an imaginary line that shall serve to show the possibility of supplying the lacuna according to the mind of the poet, though we can scarcely expect ever to arrive at the exact truth of the matter.

> *λόγοις δὲ συμβὰς καὶ θεῶν ἀνώμοτος*
> *φίλος γένοι' ἂν, κἀπικηρυκεύματα*
> [*τούτων προτιμῶν, τῆσδε τλήμονος λιταῖς*]
> *οὐκ ἂν πίθοιο.*

At verse 1246 we have Dochmiac metre, which being tolerably well understood, enables us to detect metrical errors and to pronounce upon their existence with some degree of certainty. There are several lines in the strophe and antistrophe which do not sufficiently correspond, even after the pains bestowed on them by the learned, and there are also some interruptions of the Dochmiac metre not easily rendered acceptable to the observer. The metre therefore assures us that our manuscript copies are here faulty.

The same conclusion may be drawn from the abruptness of the diction, which is little suitable to the manner of the author now before us. Two deities have been invoked, and suddenly we come upon the word *σᾶς*, *thine*, which refers, of course, to only one of them. Campbell, in his version of this chorus, has escaped the awkwardness by separating the single invocation *Ἰὼ Γᾶ τε καὶ παμφαὴς ἀκτὶς Ἀελίου* into two, first addressing the goddess Earth and next the Sun.

> " Hallow'd Earth, with indignation
> Mark, oh mark the murderous deed!

Radiant eye of wide creation,
Watch th' accursed homicide!"

The harmony of construction and propriety of expression require, then, that before the word *σᾶs* we should have a name of the sun repeated. This therefore directs our general suspicion of error tt one particular defect in our editions.

Again, in the antistrophe we hear the question asked, why is Medea enraged? *τί σοι φρενῶν βαρὺs χόλοs προσπίτνει;* Such a question however is not aptly asked at this stage of the story; a cause was not to be sought for her anger so late as this, and indeed the reason of her wrath had been often mentioned, even by the chorus itself, as in verse 1000, *ἕνεκεν λεχέων.* What question then could aptly be put in nearly the same words? we would venture to write *τίs* for *τί.* What is this anger? how dreadful! how unnatural!

For the end of supplying a vocative before *σᾶs,* we may perhaps be allowed to suggest a restoration which is founded upon the Dochmiac metre, and the probability that it prevails throughout.

[*κάτιδε, Φοῖβε*] *σᾶs γὰρ ἀπὸ χρυσέαs,*
⏑⏑⏑–⏑–‖⏑⏑⏑–⏑–

For the lacuna being admitted, it next becomes requisite to supply it in the completest manner. What is mentioned is given rather with a view to show that there exist traces of a once unbroken series of Dochmiac lines, than as containing the best approach to the original. Perhaps then, in the strophe, we may be further permitted to offer for consideration, until something nearer the truth be struck out,

[*κάτιδε, Φοῖβε*] *σᾶs γὰρ ἀπὸ χρυσέαs*
γονᾶs ἔβλαστεν· πίτνειν δ' αἷμα θεῶν
φόβοs ὑπ' ἀνέρων.

In the antistrophe,

τίs, [*ὦ*] *δειλαία, φρενῶν* [*τίs*] *βαρὺs*
χόλοs προσπίτνει σοι καὶ δυσμενὴs
φόνοs ἀμείβεται;

A serious objection however to these hypothetical corrections is found in the circumstance, that the lines of the strophe and antistrophe do not sufficiently, syllable by syllable, correspond.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. JANUARY 24, 1845. No. 28.

Professor WILSON in the Chair.

The following gentlemen were elected Members of the Society:

Thomas Dyer, Esq., Kenton Street, Brunswick Square.
Rev. D. W. Marks, Burton Street, Burton Crescent.
Trevethan Spicer, Esq., Gerrard Street, Soho.

Two papers were then read:

1. "Miscellaneous Contributions to the Ethnography of North America." By R. G. Latham, M.D.

The present state of American Ethnography is the excuse for the miscellaneous character of the following notices. What remains just now to be done consists chiefly in the addition of details to an outline already made out. Such communications, however, are mainly intended to serve as isolated points of evidence towards the two following statements:—

1. That no American language has an isolated position when compared with the other tongues *en masse*, rather than with the languages of any particular class.

2. That the affinity between the languages of the New World, as determined by their *vocabularies*, is not less real than that inferred from the analogies of their *grammatical structure*.

Modifications of the current doctrines, as to the value of certain philological groups and classifications, are involved in the positions given above.

The Sitca and Kenay Languages.—That these languages are Esquimaux may be seen by reference to the comparative vocabularies in Lisiansky's Voyages and Baer's Statistische und Ethnographische Nachrichten, &c.

The Ugalyachmutsi.—In the work last quoted this language is shown to be akin to the Kenay. It is termed *Ugalenz*, and is spoken in Russian America, near Mount St. Elias. It has hitherto been too much disconnected from the Esquimaux group.

The Chipewyan and Nagail.—That these were Esquimaux was stated by the author in the Ethnological subsection of the British Association at York. The Taculli is also Esquimaux. The Sussee, in the present state of our knowledge, is best left without any absolute place. It has several miscellaneous affinities.

The bearing of these notices is to merge the groups called *Athabascan* and *Kolooch* in the Esquimaux.

It has been communicated to the Ethnological Society, that a majority of the languages of Oregon and New Caledonia are akin to each other and to the Esquimaux; a statement applying to about forty-five vocabularies, amongst which are the three following, hitherto considered as isolated:—

1. *The Friendy Village vocabulary of Mackenzie.* See Travels.—This is a dialect of the Billechoola.

2. *The Atna of Mackenzie.*—This is a dialect of the Noosdalum.

3. *The Salish of Duponceau.* See Archæologia Americana.—This is the Okanagan of Mr. Tolmie. See Journal of Geographical Society.

The Ahnenin.—In this language, as well as in two others hereafter to be noticed (the Blackfoot and Crow), I have had, through the courtesy of Dr. Prichard, an opportunity of using valuable vocabularies of Gallatin's, collected by Mr. Mackenzie, an agent for the American fur-company on the Yellow-stone river; by whom also were drawn up the shorter vocabularies, in Mr. Catlin's work on the American Indians, of the Mandan, Riccaree and other languages. The table also of the Natchez language is chiefly drawn from the comparative catalogues of Mr. Gallatin. That the MS. vocabulary of the Ahnenin represents the language of the Fall Indians of Umfreville, and one different from that of the true Minetares (with which it has been confounded), may be seen from the following comparison.

English.	Fall-Indian of Umfreville.	Ahnenin.	Minetare.
eye	nunnecsoon	araythya	ishtah.
knife	warth	wahnta	matzee.
pipe	pechouon	einpssah	eekeepee.
tobacco	cheesouon	kitchtawan	owpai.
dog	hudther	ahttah	matshuga.
fire	usitter	....	beerais.
bow	bart	....	beerahhah.
arrow	utcee	....	eetan.
one	karci	....	lemoisso.
two	neece	nethiyau	noopah.
three	narce	....	namee.
four	nean	yahnayau	topah.
five	yautune	....	cheehoh.
six	neteartuce	....	acamai.
seven	nesartuce	....	chappo.
eight	narswartuce	....	nopuppee.
nine	anharbetwartuce	....	nowassappai.
ten	mettartuce	netassa	peeraga.

The Ahnenin language, without being at present referable to any recognized group, has numerous miscellaneous affinities.

English	*God.*
Ahnenin	esis—*sun.*
Sheshatapoosh	shayshoursh.
Passamaquoddy	saisos.

English	*hair.*
Ahnenin	betamnita.
Caddo	baat.
Taculli	pitsa—*head.*
Uche	pseotan—*head.*

English	*ear.*
Ahnenin	etah.
Esquimaux	heutinga.
——	tsheeutik.
——	shudik.
Knistenaux	otowegu.
Ojibbeway	ottowug.
Micmac	hadowugan.
Massachusetts	wehtoughh.
Narragansets	wuttowwog.
Delaware	wittauk.

Miami	tawakeh.
Shawnoe	towakah.
Omohaw	neetah.
Osage	naughta.
Quappa	nottah.

English	*nose.*
Ahnenin	husi.
Old Algonkin	yash.
Massachusetts	wutch.

English	*mouth.*
Ahnenin	ockya.
Osage	ehaugh.
Natchez	heche.

English	*fingers.*
Ahnenin	naha.
Onondagos	eniage.

English	*blood.*
Ahnenin	barts.
Caddo	baaho.

English	*hand.*
Ahnenin	ikickan.
Pawnee	iksheeree.
Muskoge	innkke.
Catawba	eeksapeeah.
Mohawk	oochsoochta.

English	*leg.*
Ahnenin	nunaha.
Sack and Fox	nenanah.
Caddo	danuna—*foot.*

English	*man.*
Ahnenin	neehato—*white man.*
——	watamahat—*black? man.*
Tuscarora	aineehau.
Nottoway	eniha.
Seneca	ungouh.
Wyandot	aingahon.
Mohawk	oonguich.
Dacota	weetschahsktah.

English	*girl.*
Ahnenin	wahtah.
Dacota	weetsheeahnah.
Yancton	weetchinchano.
——	weetachnong—*daughter.*
Osage	wetongah—*sister.*

English	*wife.*
Ahnenin	etha.
Kenay	ssióo.

English	*water.*
Ahnenin	nitsa.
Quappa	nih.
Uche	tsach.

English	*sun.*
Ahnenin	esis.
Algonkin	kesis.
Choctaw	hashe.
Chikkasaw	husha.
Muskoge	hahsie.

English	*rock.*
Ahnenin	hannike.
Winebago	eenee.
Dacota	eeang.
Yancton	eeyong.
Mohawk	oonoyah.
Onondago	onaja.

English	*wood.*
Ahnenin	bess.
Passamaquoddy	apass—*tree.*
Abenaki	abassi—*tree.*

English	*bear.*
Ahnenin	wussa.
Quappa	wassah.
Osage	wasauba.
Omahaw	wassabai.

English	*dog.*
Ahnenin	ahttah.
——	hudther.
Sheshatapoosh	attung.
Abenaki	attie.
Tuscarora	tcheer.
Nottoway	cheer.

English	*elk.*
Ahnenin	wussea.
Miami	musuoh—*deer.*
Illinois	mousoah—*deer.*

English	*bad.*
Ahnenin	wahnatta.
Mohawk	wahpateku.
Onondagos	wahethe.
Oneida	wahetka.

English	*good.*
Ahnenin	etah.
Caddo	hahut—*handsome.*
English	*me, mine.*
Ahnenin	nistow.
Blackfoot	nisto—*I.*
English	*you.*
Ahnenin	ahnan.
Kenay	nan.
English	*to-day.*
Ahnenin	wananaki.
Mohawk	kuhhwanteh.
Onondagos	neucke.
English	*to-morrow.*
Ahnenin	nacah.
Tchuktchi	unako.
——	unniok.
Choctaw	onaha.
English	*many.*
Ahnenin	ukaka.
Mohawk	awquayakoo.
Seneca	kawkuago.
English	*drink.*
Ahnenin	nahbin.
Osage	nebnatoh.
English	*sleep.*
Ahnenin	nuckcoots.
Abenaki	nekasi.
Mohawk	yihkootos.
Onondagos	agotawi.
Seneca	wanuhgoteh.

English	*two.*
Ahnenin	neece.
Passamaquoddy	nes.
Abenaki	niss.
Massachusetts	neese.
Narragansets	neesse.
Mohican	neesoh.
Montaug	nees.
——	neeze.
Adaize	nass.
English	*three.*
Ahnenin	narce.
Abenaki	nash.
Narragansets	nish.
English	*four.*
Ahnenin	nean.
——	yahnayau.
Ojibbeway	newin.
Ottawa	niwin.
Knistenaux	nayo.
Old Algonkin	neyoo.
Sheshatapoosh	naou.
Massachusetts	yaw.
Narragansets	yoh.
English	*six.*
Ahnenin	nekitukujan.
Knistenaux	negotoahsik.
Ojibbeway	gotoasso.
——	nigouta waswois.
Ottawa	ningotowaswi.
Abenaki	negudaus.
Montaug	nacuttah.

The Blackfoot.—Of this language we have three vocabularies; a short one by Umfreville, a short one in Mr. Catlin's work, and the longer and more important one in Mr. Gallatin's manuscripts. The three vocabularies represent the same language. Its affinities are miscellaneous; more however with the Algonkin tongues than with those of the other recognized groups.

English	*woman.*
Blackfoot	ahkeya.
Old Algonkin	ickweh.
Ottawa	uque.
Delaware	okhqueh.
——	khqeu.
Nanticoke	acquahique.
Illinois	ickoe.
Shawnoe	equiwa.
Sauki	kwoyikih.
Cherokee	ageyung.
Woccoon	yecauau.

English	*boy.*
Blackfoot	sacoomahpa.
Upsaroka	skakkatte.

English	*girl.*
Blackfoot	ahkaquoin.
Catawba	yahwachahu.

English	*child.*
Blackfoot	pokah.
Upsaroka	bakkatte.

English	*father.*
Blackfoot	onwa.
Seneca	hanee.

English	*husband.*
Blackfoot	ohmah.
Esquimaux	oemah.

English	*daughter.*
Blackfoot	netan.
Knistenaux	netannis.
Ojibbeway	nindanis.
——	nedannis.
Ottawa	tanis.
Massachusetts	nutannis.
Narragansets	nittannis.
Illinois	tahana.
Sack and Fox	tanes.
Uche	teyunung.

English	*brother.*
Blackfoot	nausah.
Passamaquoddy	nesiwas.
Abenaki	nitsie.

English	*head.*
Blackfoot	otoquoin.
Old Algonkin	oostiquan.
Sheshatapoosh	stoukoan.
Ojibbeway	oostegwon.
Knistenaux	istegwen.
——	ustequoin.

English	*nose.*
Blackfoot	okissis.
Menomeni	oocheeush.

English	*neck.*
Blackfoot	ohkokin.
Miami	kwaikaneh.
Sack and Fox	nekwaikaneh.

English	*hand.*
Blackfoot	okittakis.
Esquimaux	iyuteeka.
——	tikkiek—*fingers.*

English	*leg.*
Blackfoot	ohcat.
Ojibbeway	okat.
Knistenaux	miskate.
Sheshatapoosh	neescatch.
Massachusetts	muhkout.
Menomeni	oakauut.

English	*feet.*
Blackfoot	oaksakah.
Wyandot	ochsheetau.
Mohawk	oochsheeta.
Onondago	ochsita.
Seneca	oochsheeta.
Oneyda	ochsheecht.
Nottoway	seeke—*toes.*

English	*bone.*
Blackfoot	ohkinnah.
Knistenaux	oskann.
Ojibbeway	okun.
Ottawa	okunnum.
Miami	kanih.
Massachusetts	uskon.
Narragansets	wuskan.
Shawnoe	ochcunne.
Sack and Fox	okaneh.
Menomeni	okunum.

English	*kettle.*
Blackfoot	eske.
Knistenaux	askick.
Ojibbeway	akkeek.

English	*shoes.*
Blackfoot	atsakin.
Mohawk	ohtaquah.
Seneca	auhtoyuawohya.
Nottoway	otawgwag.

English	*bread.*
Blackfoot	ksaquonats.
Mohican	tauquauh.
Shawnoe	taquanah.

English	*spring.*
Blackfoot	motoe.
Osage	paton.

English	*summer.*
Blackfoot	napoos.
Knistenaux	nepin.
Ojibbeway	neebin.
——	nipin.

Ottawa	nipin.
Sheshatapoosh	neepun.
Micmac	nipk.
Abenaki	nipéné.
Massachusetts	nepun.
Narragansets	neepun.
Mohican	nepoon.
Delaware	nipen.
Miami	nipeenueh.
Shawnoe	nepeneh.
Sack and Fox	neepenweh.
Menomeni	neeaypeenaywaywah.
English	*hail.*
Blackfoot	sahco.
Knistenaux	sasagun.
Ojibbeway	sasaigan.
Sheshatapoosh	shashaygan.
English	*fire.*
Blackfoot	esteu.
Mohican	stauw.
English	*water.*
Blackfoot	ohhkeah.
Chikkasaw	uckah.
Attacapa	ak.
English	*ice.*
Blackfoot	sacoocootah.
Esquimaux	sikkoo.
Tchuktchi	tshikuta.
English	*earth.*
Blackfoot	ksahcoom.
Knistenaux	askee.
Ojibbeway	ahkee.
Ottawa	aki.
Old Algonkin	ackey.
——	ackwin.
English	*lake.*
Blackfoot	omah sekame.
Knistenaux	sakiegun.
Ojibbeway	sahgiegun.
Shawnoe	mskaque.
English	*island.*
Blackfoot	mane.
Upsaroka	minne—*water.*
——	minneteekah—*lake.*
——	minnepeshu—*island.*

Knistenaux	ministick.
Ojibbeway	minnis.
Old Algonkin	minis.
Passamaquoddy	muniqu.
Abenaki	menahan.
Mohican	mnauhan.
Delaware	menokhtey.
——	menatey.
Miami	menahanweh.
Menomeni	meenayish.
English	*rock, stone.*
Blackfoot	ohcootoke.
Nottoway	ohhoutahk.
English	*tree.*
Blackfoot	masetis.
Ojibbeway	metik.
Old Algonkin	metiih.
Sheshatapoosh	mistookooah.
Massachusetts	mehtug.
English	*grass.*
Blackfoot	mahtooyaase.
Miami	metahkotuck.
Quappa	montih.
English	*leaf.*
Blackfoot	soyapoko.
Massachusetts	wunnepog.
Narragansets	wunnepog.
Mohican	wunnepok.
Miami	metshipakwa.
Sack and Fox	tatapacoan.
Menomeni	ahneepeeoakunah.
English	*beaver.*
Blackfoot	kakestake.
Esquimaux	keeyeeak.
English	*wolf.*
Blackfoot	mahcooya.
Esquimaux	amaok.
Knistenaux	myegun.
Ojibbeway	mieengun.
——	maygan.
Old Algonkin	mahingan.
Massachusetts	muckquoshin.
Narragansets	muckquashin.
Miami	muhkwaiauch.
English	*bird.*
Blackfoot	pakesa.
Massachusetts	psukses.
Narragansets	peasis.

English	*egg.*
Blackfoot	ohwas.
Taculli	ogaze.
Kenay	kquasa.
Cherokee	oowatse.
Salish	ooseh.

English	*goose.*
Blackfoot	emahkiya.
Menomeni	mckawk.

English	*partridge.*
Blackfoot	katokin.
Nanticoke	kitteawndipqua.

English	*red.*
Blackfoot	mohisenum.
Massachusetts	misqueh.

English	*yellow.*
Blackfoot	ohtahko.
Esquimaux	toongook.
——	tshongak.
Knistenaux	asawwow.
Ojibbeway	ozawa.
——	ojawa.
Old Algonkin	oozao.
Sack and Fox	ossawah.
Menomeni	oashahweeyah.

English	*great.*
Blackfoot	ohmohcoo.
Micmac	mechkilk.
Mohican	makauk.

English	*small.*
Blackfoot	enahcootse.
Upsaroka	ecat.

English	*strong.*
Blackfoot	miskappe.
Knistenaux	mascawa.
Ojibbeway	machecawa.
Old Algonkin	masshkawa.
Nanticoke	miskiu.

English	*warm.*
Blackfoot	kazetotzu.
Knistenaux	kichatai.
——	kisopayo.
Ojibbeway	kezhoyah.
Ottawa	keshautta.
Old Algonkin	akishattey.
Passamaquoddy	kesipetai.
Massachusetts	kussuttan.
Narragansets	kssetauwou.

English	*I.*
Blackfoot	nisto.
Chipewyan	ne.
Knistenaux	nitha.
——	neya.
Ojibbeway	neen, nin.
Old Algonkin	nir.
Sheshatapoosh	neele.
Micmac	nil.
Illinois	nira.
Ahnenin	nistow.

English	*thou.*
Blackfoot	christo.
Knistenaux	kitha.
Ojibbeway	keen, kin.
Old Algonkin	kir.
Micmac	kil.
Illinois	kira.

English	*this, that.*
Blackfoot	kanakha.
Upsaroka	kinna.
Nanticoke	youkanna.

English	*to-day.*
Blackfoot	anookchusiquoix.
Knistenaux	anoutch.
Onondago	neuchke.

English	*yesterday.*
Blackfoot	mahtone.
Dacota	tanneehah.

English	*drink.*
Blackfoot	semate.
Upsaroka	smimmik.

English	*speak.*
Blackfoot	apooyatz.
Upsaroka	bidow.

English	*sing.*
Blackfoot	anihkit.
Knistenaux	necŭmmoon.
Ojibbeway	nugamoo.
Sheshatapoosh	nekahmoo.
Illinois	nacamohok.
Menomeni	neekaumeenoon.

English	*sleep.*
Blackfoot	okat.
Mohawk	yihkootos.
Onondago	agotawi.
Seneca	wanuhgoteh.

English	*kill.*
Blackfoot	enikke.
Abenaki	nenirke.

The Blackfoot numerals, as given by Mackenzie and Umfreville, slightly differ. The termination in *-um* runs through the numerals of Fitz-Hugh Sound, an Oregon language.

English.	Blackfoot of Umfreville.	Blackfoot of Mackenzie.	Fitz-Hugh Sound.
one	tokescum	sa	nimscum.
two	nartokescum	nahtoka	malscum.
three	nohokescum	nahhoka	utascum.
four	nesweum	nasowe	moozcum.
five	nesittwi	nesitto	thikaescum.
six	nay	nowwe	kitliscum.
seven	kitsic	akitsecum	atloopooscum.
eight	narnesweum	nahnissowe	malknaskum.
nine	picksee	pakeso	nanooskim.
ten	keepey	kepo	highio.

2. nekty, *Tuscarora*; ticknee, *Seneca*; teghia, *Oneida*; dekanee, *Nottoway*; tekini, *Otto*.
3. noghoh, *Mohican*; nakha, *Delaware*.
5. nthsysta, *Mohawk*; sattou, *Quappa*; satta, *Osage, Omahaw*; sata, *Otto*; sahtsha, *Minetare*.
7. tzauks, *Kawitchen, Noosdalum*.
10. kippio, *Chimmesyan*.

The Crow and Mandan Languages.—Of the important language of the Upsarokas or Crows the Archæologia Americana contains only thirty words. Of the Mandan we have, in the same work, nothing beyond the names of ten chiefs. In Gallatin's classification these tribes are dealt with as subdivisions of the Minetare nation. Now the Minetare are of the Sioux or Dacota family.

Between the Mandan vocabulary of Mr. Catlin and the Crow vocabulary of Gallatin's MSS. there are the following words in common. The affinity seems less close than it is generally stated to be: still the two languages appear to be Sioux. This latter point may be seen in the second table.

English.	Mandan.	Crow.
God	mahhopeneta	sakahbooatta.
sun	menahka	a'hhhiza.
moon	esto menakha	minnatatche.
stars	h'kaka	ekieu.
rain	h'kahoost	hannah.
snow	copcaze	makkoupah—*hail*,
river	passahah	ahesu.

English.	Mandan.	Crow.
day	hampah	maupah.
night	estogr	oche.
dark	hampaheriskah	chippusheka.
light	edayhush	thieshe.
woman	meha	meyakatte.
wife	moorse	moah.
child	sookhomaha	bakkatte.
girl	sookmeha	meyakatte.
boy	sooknumohk	shakkatte.
head	pan	marshaa.
legs	doka	buchoope.
eyes	estume	meishta.
mouth	ea	ea.
nose	pahoo	buppa.
face	estah	esa.
ears	nakoha	uppa.
hand	onka	buschie.
fingers	onkahah	buschie.
foot	shee	busche.
hair	hahhee	masheah.
canoe	menanko	maheshe.
fish	poh	booah.
bear	mahto	duhpitsa.
wolf	haratta	chata.
dog	mones warootа	biska.
buffalo	ptemday	bisha.
elk	omepah	eitchericazzse.
deer	mahmanacoo	ohha.
beaver	warrappa	biruppe.
shoe	hoompah	hoompe.
bow	warraenoopah	bistuheeah.
arrow	mahha	ahnailz.
pipe	ehudka	ompsa.
tobacco	mannasha	hopa.
good	shushu	itsicka.
bad	k'hecush	kubbeek.
hot	dsasosh	ahre.
cold	shineehush	hootshere.
I	me	be.
thou	ne	de.
he	e	na.
we	noo	bero.
they	eonah	mihah.
1	mahhannah	amutcat.
2	nompah	noomcat.
3	namary	namenacat.
4	tohha	shopecat.
5	kakhoo	chihhocat.
6	kemah	ahcamacat.

English.	Mandan.	Crow.
7	koopah	sappoah.
8	tatucka	noompape.
9	mahpa	ahmuttappe.
10	perug	perakuk.

English	*God.*
Mandan	mahhopeneta.
Winebago	mahahnah.
Minetare	manhopa.
Algonkin	marutoo.

English	*sun.*
Mandan	menahka.
Omahaw	meencajai.
Caddo	manoh—*light.*

English	*star.*
Mandan	h'kaka.
Quappa	mihcacheh.
Otto	peekahhai.
Omahaw	meecaai.
Minetare	eekah.

English	*day.*
Mandan	hampah eriskah.
Winebago	haunip.
———	haumpeehah.
Dacota	anipa.
Yancton	aungpa.
Osage	hompaye.
Otto	hangwai.
Omahaw	ombah.
Minetare	mahpaih.

English	*woman.*
Mandan	meha.
Yancton	weeah.
Omahaw	waoo.
Minetare	meeyai.
Ioway	mega.

English	*child.*
Mandan	sookhomaha.
Quappa	schehjinka.
Otto	cheechingai.
Omahaw	shingashinga.

English	*head.*
Mandan	pan.
Dacota	pah.
Yancton	pah.
Quappa	pahhih.
Omahaw	pah.

English	*arms.*
Mandan	arda.
Minetare	arrough.
Pawnee	heeeeru.

English	*leg.*
Mandan	doka.
Quappa	jaccah.
Osage	sagaugh.

English	*eyes.*
Mandan	estume.
Dacota	ishta.
Yancton	ishtah.
Quappa	inschta.
Otto &c.	ishta.

English	*mouth.*
Mandan	ea.
Sioux passim	ea.

English	*nose.*
Mandan	pahoo.
Sioux passim	pah.

English	*face.*
Mandan	estah.
Dacota	eetai.
Yancton	eetai.
Minetare	etah.

English	*ears.*
Mandan	nakoha.
Winebago	nahchahwahhah.
Yancton	nougkopa.
Osage	naughta.

English	*hands.*
Mandan	onka.
Nottoway	nunke.
Tuscarora	ohehneh.
Menomeni	oanah.
Miami	enahkee.

English	*fingers.*
Mandan	onkahah.
Onodago	eniage.
Wyandot	eyingia.
Tchuktchi	ainhanka.

English	*foot.*
Mandan	shee.
Sioux	sih.
Pawnee	ashoo.
Tuscarora	uhseh
English	*hair.*
Mandan	pahhee.
Sioux	pahee.
English	*fish.*
Mandan	poh.
Minetare	boa.
Sioux	ho, hough.
English	*beaver.*
Mandan	warappah.
Minetare	meerapa.
Otto	rawaiy.
English	*deer.*
Mandan	mahmanaco.
Yancton	tamindoca.
English	*house.*
Mandan	ote.
Ioway	tshe.
English	*bow.*
Mandan	warraenoopah.
Minetare	beerahhah.
Tuscarora	awraw.
English	*arrow.*
Mandan	mahha.
Sioux	mong, ma.
English	*shoe.*
Mandan	hoompah.
Dacota	hanipa.
Quappa	honpeh.
Minetare	opah.
English	*bad.*
Mandan	k'hecush.
Dacota	sheecha.
English	*cold.*
Mandan	shineekush.
Winebago	seeneehee.
Sioux	snee.
English	*no.*
Mandan	megosh.
Tuscarora	gwush.
English	*I.*
Mandan	me.
Dacota	meeah.

Minetare	meeee.
Quappa	vieh.
Osage	veca.
English	*thou.*
Mandan	ne.
Winebago	ney.
Dacota	neeah.
Minetare	nehe.
English	*he.*
Mandan	e.
Dacota	eeah.
English	*we.*
Mandan	noo.
Winebago	neehwahkiaweeno
Onondago	ni.
Knistenaux	neou.
English	*one.*
Mandan	mahhannah.
Osage	minche.
Omahaw	meeachchee.
English	*two.*
Mandan	nompah.
Sioux	nompa, noopa.
Uche	nowah.
English	*three.*
Mandan	namary.
Minetare	namee.
English	*four.*
Mandan	tohha.
Sioux	topah, tuah.
English	*five.*
Mandan	kakhoo.
Minetare	cheehoh.
Muskoge	chahgkie.
English	*six.*
Mandan	kemah.
Minetare	acamai.
English	*seven.*
Mandan	koopah.
Minetare	chappo.
English	*eight.*
Mandan	tatucka.
Seneca	tikkeugh.
Mohawk	sohtayhhko.
English	*ten.*
Mandan	perug.
Minetare	peragas.

The Riccaree Language.—In Balbi and in the Mithridates, the Riccaree is stated to be a dialect of the Pawnee; but no words are given of it: hence the evidence is inconclusive. Again, the term Pawnee is equivocal. There are tribes called Pawnees on the river Platte, and tribes called Pawnees on the Red river of Texas. Of the last nation we have no vocabulary; they appear however to be different from the first, and are Pawnees *falsely so called.*

Of the Riccaree we have but one vocabulary (Catlin's North American Indians, vol. ii.); it has the following words common with the *true* Pawnee list of Say in the Archæologia Americana, vol. ii.

English.	Pawnee.	Riccaree.
God	thouwahot	tewaroohteh.
devil	tsaheekshkakooraiwah	kakewaroohteh.
sun	shakoroo	shakoona.
fire	tateetoo	tekieeht.
moon	pa	wetah.
stars	opeereet	saca.
rain	tatsooroo	tassou.
snow	toosha	tahhau.
day	shakoorooeeshairet	shacona.
night	eeraishnaitee	eenahgt.
light	shusheegat	shakoonah.
dark	eeraishuaite	tekatistat.
hot	toueetstoo	towwarist.
cold	taipeechee	teepse.
yes	nawa	neecoola.
no	kakee	kaka.
bear	koorooksh	keahya.
dog	ashakish	hohtch.
bow	teeragish	nache.
arrow	leekshoo	neeche.
hut	akkaroo	acare.
woman	tsapat	sapat.
boy	peeshkee	weenatch.
girl	tchoraksh	soonahtch.
child	peeron	pera.
head	pakshu	pahgh.
ears	atkaroo	tickokite.
eyes	keereekoo	cheereecoo.
hair	oshu	pahi.
hand	iksheeree	tehonare.
fingers	hashpeet	parick.
foot	ashoo	ahgh.
canoe	lakohoroo	lahkeehoon.
river	kattoosh	sahonnee.
I	ta	nanto.
1	askoo	asco.
2	peetkoo	pitco.
3	touweet	towwit.

English.	Pawnee.	Riccaree.
4	shkeetish	tcheetish.
5	sheeooksh	tcheetishoo.
6	sheekshabish	tcheetishpis.
7	peetkoosheeshabish	totchapis.
8	touweetshabish	tochapiswon.
9	looksheereewa	totchapisnahhenewon.
10	looksheeree	nahen.
20	petouoo	wetah.
30	luksheereewetouoo	sahwee.
100	sheekookshtaroo	shontan.

The special affinities of the Riccaree are not very decided. It is anything rather than an isolated language, and will, probably, be definitely placed when we obtain vocabularies of the Indian languages of Texas.

English	*evil spirit.*
Riccaree	kakewaroohteh.
Catawba	yahwerejeh.

English	*sun.*
Riccaree	shakoona.
Caddo	sako.
Salish	skokoleel.
Delaware	gishukh.
Mohican	kesogh.
Esquimaux	sukkenuk.
Tchuktchi	shekenak.

English	*stars.*
Riccaree	saca.
Caddo	tsokas.

English	*night.*
Riccaree	enaght.
Esquimaux	oonooak.
——	unjuk.
Massachusetts	nukon.

English	*dark.*
Riccaree	tekatistat.
Attacapa	tegg—*night.*
Natchez	toowa—*night.*
Mohawk	tewhgarlars.
Oneida	tetiucalas.

English	*snow.*
Riccaree	tahhau.
Adaize	towat.
Natchez	kowa.
Uche	stahae.

English	*fire.*
Riccaree	tekieeht.
Onondagos	yotecka.
Ioway	tako.
Ugalenz	takgak.
Kenay	taze.

English	*cold.*
Riccaree	teepse.
Attacapa	tsamps.

English	*bad.*
Riccaree	kah.
Mandan	k'hecush.
Sioux	sheecha.

English	*boy.*
Riccaree	weenatch.
Nottoway	aqueianha.
Esquimaux	einyook.
Winebago	eeneek—*son.*
Oneida	yungh.

English	*head, hair.*
Riccaree	pahgh, pahi.
Sioux	pah, pan.
Massachusetts	puhkuk.
Choctaw	eebuk.
Chiccasaw	skoboch.

English	*eye.*
Riccaree	cheereeco.
Tuscarora	ookawreh.
Esquimaux	eerruka.

English	*foot.*
Riccaree	ahgh.
Choctaw	iya.
Chiccasaw	eaya.

English	*arms.*
Riccaree	arrai.
Mandan	arda.
Tuscarora	orungjai.

English	*bear.*
Riccaree	keahya.
Seneca	yucwy.
Tchuktchi	kainga.

English	*shoes.*
Riccaree	hooche
Sioux	hongha.

English	*arrow.*
Riccaree	neeche.
Choctaw	oski noki.
Chiccasaw	nucka.

English	*hut.*
Riccaree	acane.
Mohawk	canuchsha.
Onondago	ganschsaje.
Oneida	kaunoughsau.
Tuscarora	yaukuhnugh.

English	*canoe.*
Riccaree	lahkeehoon.
Taculli	allachee.
Salish	'tlea'yh.

English	*yes.*
Riccaree	neecoola.
Adaize	cola.

English	*no.*
Riccaree	kaka.
Chetimacha	kahie.
Algonkin	kah.
Kenay	kukol.

English	*I.*
Riccaree	nanto.
Algonkin	neen.

English	*you.*
Riccaree	kaghon.
Algonkin	keen.

English	*one.*
Riccaree	asco.
Wyandot	scat.
Mohawk	huskat.
Onondago	skata.
Seneca	skaut.

English	*two.*
Riccaree	pitco.
Caddo	behit.

English	*four.*
Riccaree	tcheetish.
Attacapa	tsets.

English	*thirty.*
Riccaree	sahwee.
Cherokee	tsawaskaw.

The Creek and Choctaw Languages.—That the question as to the affinity between the Creek and the Choctaw languages is a question of classification rather than of fact, may be seen from the Archæologia Americana, vol. ii. p. 405; where it is shown that out of six hundred words, ninety-seven are common to the two languages.

The Caddo.—That this language has affinities with the Mohawk, Seneca, and the Iroquois tongues in general, and that it has words common to the Muskoge, the Catawba, the Pawnee, and the Cherokee languages may be seen from the tables of the Archæologia Americana. The illustrations however of these languages are to be drawn from a knowledge of the dialects of Texas and the Oregon districts, tracts of country whereon our information is preeminently insufficient.

The Natchez.—This language has the following miscellaneous affinities, insufficient to give it a place in any definite group, but sufficient to show that it is anything rather than an isolated language.

English	*man.*
Natchez	tomkuhpena.
Cochimi	tamma.
St. Xavier	tamma.

Loretto	tamma.
St. Borgia	tama.
Othomi	dame.
Shahaptan	hama.
English	*woman.*
Natchez	tamahl.
Huasteca	tomol.
English	*girl.*
Natchez	hohlenoo.
Noosdalum	islanie.
Squallyamish	islanie.
Kawitchen	islanie.
English	*head.*
Natchez	tomme apoo.
Dacota	pah.
Yancton	pah.
Quappa	pahih.
Omahaw	pah.
English	*hair.*
Natchez	etene.
Mixteca	dzini.
English	*eye.*
Natchez	oktool.
Mexican	ikhtelolotli.
English	*nose.*
Natchez	shamats.
Huasteca	zam.
English	*mouth.*
Natchez	heche.
Poconchi	chi.
Maya	chi.
English	*tooth.*
Natchez	int.
Calapooiah	tinti.
Mexican	tentli—*lip.*
Cora	tenita.
English	*moon.*
Natchez	kwasip.
St. Antonio	tatsoopai.
Kawitchen	quassin—*stars.*
Noosdalum	quassin—*stars.*
English	*star.*
Natchez	tookul.
St. Antonio	tatchhuanilh.
Cathlascou	tukycha napucha.
Caddo	tsokas.

English	*river.*
Natchez	wol.
Pima	vo—*lake.*
Cathlascou	emalh.
English	*hill.*
Natchez	kweyakoopsel.
St. Juan Capistrano	kahui.
Kliketat	keh.
Dacota	khyaykah.
Yancton	haiaca.
English	*maize.*
Natchez	hokko.
Adaize	ocasuck.
English	*tree.*
Natchez	tshoo.
Choctaw	itte.
Chikkasaw	itta.
Muskoge	ittah.
English	*flesh.*
Natchez	wintse.
Algonkin	wioss.
English	*deer.*
Natchez	tza.
Winebago	tcha.
Quappa	tah.
Muskoge	itzo.
Caddo	dah.
English	*buffalo.*
Natchez	wastanem.
Uche	wetenenvuenekah.
English	*fish.*
Natchez	henn.
Chimmesyan	hone kustamoane —*salmon.*
Kliketat	tkinnat.
Shahaptan	tkinnat.
Mohawk	keyunk.
Seneca	kenyuck.
Oneida	kunjoon.
Nottoway	kaintu.
Yancton	hohung.
English	*white.*
Natchez	hahap.
Shahaptan	hipi.
Attacapa	cobb.
Old Angonkin	wabi.

Delaware	wape.
Shawnoe	opee.
English	*black.*
Natchez	tsokokop.
Narragansets	suckesu.
Long Island	shickayo.
English	*bad.*
Natchez	wattaks.
Mohawk	wahhatekuh.
Onondago	wahethe.
Oneida	wahetka.
English	*cold.*
Natchez	tzitakopana.
Kliketat	tsoisah.
Shahaptan	tsoisah.
English	*hot.*
Natchez	wahiloohie.
Muskoge	hahiye.
Attacapa	alliu.
English	*I.*
Natchez	tukehah.
Adaize	hicatuck.
Chetimacha	uticheca.
English	*thou.*
Natchez	ukkehah.
Kliketat	yuke.
English	*arm.*
Natchez	ish.
Dacota	ishto.
Yancton	isto.
English	*blood.*
Natchez	itsh.
Choctaw	issish.
Chikkasaw	issish.
English	*town.*
Natchez	walt.
Pawnee	kwat.
English	*house.*
Natchez	hahit.
Dacota	tea.
Yancton	teepee.
Quappa	tih.
Osage	tiah.
Omahaw	tee.
Minetare	attee.

English	*friend.*
Natchez	ketanesuh—*my.*
Chetimacha	keta.
English	*boat.*
Natchez	kwagtolt.
Chimmesyan	waigh—*paddle.*
Caddo	haugh.
English	*sky.*
Natchez	nasookta.
Chimmesyan	suchah.
Tlaoquatch	naase.
Muskoge	sootah.
Choctaw	shutik.
English	*sun.*
Natchez	wah.
Noosdalum	kokweh.
Squallyamish	thłokwahl.
Poconchi	quih.
Yancton	oouee.
English	*night.*
Natchez	toowa.
Chetimacha	timan.
Attacapa	tegg.
English	*summer.*
Natchez	amehika.
Billechoola	awmilk.
English	*winter.*
Natchez	kwishitshetakop.
Mohawk	koosilkhuhhuggheh.
Oneida	koashlakke.
Tuscarora	koosehhea.
Nottoway	goshera.
English	*thunder.*
Natchez	pooloopooloolunluh.
Chimmesyan	killapilleip.
English	*snow.*
Natchez	kowa.
Billechoola	kai.
English	*sea.*
Natchez	kootshel.
St. Diego	khasilk.
Choctaw	okhuttah.
English	*bear.*
Natchez	tsokohp.
Uche	ptsaka.

English	*snake.*
Natchez	wollah.
Esquimaux	malligooak.

English	*bird.*
Natchez	shankolt.
Uchee	psenna.
Tuscarora	tshenu.

English	*eat.*
Natchez	kimposko.
Muskoge	humbiischa.

English	*run.*
Natchez	kwalneskook.
Shahaptan	willnikit.

English	*kill.*
Natchez	appawe.
Choctaw	uhbe.

English	*walk.*
Natchez	naktik.
Adaize	enacoot.

The Uche, Adaize, &c.—See Archæologia Americana, vol. ii. p. 306. For these languages, tables similar to those of the Natchez have been drawn up, which indicate similar affinities. The same can be done for the Chetimacha and Attacapa.

New Californian Languages.—The dialects of this district form no exception to the statements as to the unity of the American languages. In the Journal of the Geographical Society (part 2. vol. ii.) we find seven vocabularies for these parts. Between the language of the diocese of San Juan Capistrano and that of San Gabriel, the affinity is palpable, and traces of a regular letter change are exhibited, viz. from *l* to *r*:

English.	San Juan Capistrano.	San Gabriel.
moon	mioil	muarr.
water	pal	paara.
salt	engel	ungurr.

Between the remaining vocabularies, the resemblance by no means lies on the surface; still it is unquestionable. To these *data* for New California may be added the Severnow and Bodega vocabularies in Baer's *Beiträge*, &c. These last two, to carry our comparison no further, have, amongst others, the following terms in common with the Esquimaux tongues:

English	*white.*
Severnow	kalle.
Esquimaux	kowdlook, kowlook.

English	*hand.*
Bodega	talu.
Esquimaux	tadleek, dallek—*arm.*

English	*beard.*
Bodega	ymmy.
Esquimaux	oomich.

English	*sky.*
Severnow	kalu.
Cadeack.	kilik.

English	*moon.*
Severnow	kalazha.
Kenay	golshagi.

English	*water.*
Severnow	aka.
Bodega	duka.
Ugalyachmutsc	kai.

English	*ice.*
Severnow	tulash.
Ugalyachmutsc	thlesh.
Bodega	kulla.
Fox Island.	klakh.

English	*day.*
Severnow	madzhu.
Cadeack	matsiak—*sun.*

English	*night.*
Bodega	kayl.
Ugalyachmutsc	khatl.

English	*star.*
Severnow	karnau.
Greenland	kaumeh—*moon.*
English	*head.*
St. Barbara	nucchu.

Greenland	niackoa.
English	*winter.*
Severnow	komua.
Tchuktchi	ukiumi.

The concluding notices are upon languages which have already been placed, but concerning which fresh evidence is neither superfluous nor misplaced.

Sacks and Foxes.—Cumulative to evidence already current as to the tribes of the Sacks and Foxes belonging to the Algonkin stock, it may be stated that a few words collected by the author from the Sack chief lately in London were Algonkin.

The Ojibbeways.—A fuller vocabulary, taken from the mouth of the interpreters of the Ojibbeway Indians lately exhibited, identifies their language with that represented by the vocabularies of Long, Carver, and Mackenzie.

The Ioway.—Of the Ioway Indians, Mr. Gallatin, in 1836, writes as follows:—"They are said, *though the fact is not fully ascertained,* "to speak the same dialect," *i. e.* with the Ottoes. Again, he writes, "We have not that [the vocabulary] of the Ioways, but nineteen "words supplied by Governor Cass seem to leave no doubt of its "identity with the Ottoes."—*Archæolog. Amer.* ii. 127, 128. Cass's vocabulary is printed in p. 377.

In 1843, however, a book was published in the Ioway language, bearing the following title-page, "An Elementary Book of the Ioway "Language, with an English Translation, by Wm. Hamilton and S. "M. Irvine, under the direction of the B. F. Miss: of the Presbyterian "Church: J. B. Roy, Interpreter; Ioway and Sac Mission Press, "Indian Territory, 1843." In this book the orthographical principles are by no means unexceptionable; they have the merit however of expressing simple single sounds by simple single letters: thus *v* = the *a* in *fall*; *x* = the *u* in *tub*; *c* = the *ch* in *chest*; *f* = *th*; *g* = *ng*; *j* = *sh*. Q however is preserved as a double sound = *qu*. From this alphabet it is inferred that the Ioway language possesses the rare sound of the English *th*. With the work in question I was favoured by Mr. Catlin.

Now it is only necessary to pick out from this little work the words selected by Balbi in his Atlas Ethnographique, and to compare them with the corresponding terms as given by the same author for the Sioux, the Winebago, the Otto, the Konza, the Omahaw, the Minetare, and the Osage languages, to be convinced the Ioway language belongs to the same class, coinciding more especially with the Otto.

English	*head.*
Ioway	nanthu.
Winebago	nahsso.
Otto	naso.
Minetare	antu.

English	*nose.*
Ioway	pa.
Sioux	paso.
Winebago	pah.
Otto	peso.

Konza	pah.
Omahaw	pah.
Minetare	apah.
Sioux	pah—*head.*
Omahaw	pah—*head.*

English	*mouth.*
Ioway	e.
Sioux	ei.
Winebago	i.
Otto	i.
Konza	yih, ih.
Minetare	iiiptshappah.
Omahaw	ihah.
Osage	ehaugh.

English	*hand.*
Ioway	nawæ.
Sioux	nape.
Winebago	nahpön.
Otto	naue.
Omahaw	nombe.
Osage	nomba.

English	*feet.*
Ioway	the.
Sioux	siha.
Winebago	si.
Otto	si.
Konza	sih.
Omahaw	si.
Minetare	itsi.
Osage	see.

English	*tongue.*
Ioway	ræthæ.
Otto	reze.
Sioux	tshedzhi.
Konza	yeezah.
Minetare	theysi.

English	*teeth.*
Ioway	he.
Sioux	hi.
Winebago	hi.
Otto	hi.
Konza	hih.
Omahaw	ei.
Minetare	ii.

English	*fire.*
Ioway	pæchæ.
Sioux	peta.
Winebago	pytshi.
Otto	pede.
Omahaw	pede.
Osage	pajah.

English	*water.*
Ioway	ne.
Sioux	mini.
Winebago	ninah, nih.
Otto	ni.
Omahaw	ni.
Minetare	mini.
Osage	neah.

English	*one.*
Ioway	eyungkæ.
Otto	yonke.
Sioux	wonchaw.
——	ouonnchaou.

English	*two.*
Ioway	nowæ.
Sioux	nopa.
——	nonpa.
Winebago	nopi.
Otto	noue.
Konza	nompah.
Minetare	noopah.
Osage	nombaugh.

English	*three.*
Ioway	tanye.
Winebago	tahni.
Otto	tana.

English	*four.*
Ioway	towæ.
Sioux	topah.
Winebago	tshopi.
Otto	toua.
Konza	tohpah.
Omahaw	toba.
Minetare	topah.
Osage	tobah.

English	*five.*
Ioway	thata.
Sioux	zapta.
Winebago	satsch.
Otto	sata.
Konza	sahtah.
Omahaw	satta.
Osage	sattah.

English	*six.*
Ioway	shaqæ.
Sioux	shakpe.
Winebago	kohui.
Otto	shaque.
Konza	shappeh.
Omahaw	shappe.
Osage	shapah.
English	*seven.*
Ioway	shahma.
Otto	shahemo.
Minetare	tshappo.
English	*eight.*
Ioway	krærapane.
Otto	krærabene.
Omahaw	perabini.
English	*nine.*
Ioway	ksangkæ.
Otto	shanke.
Konza	shankkoh.
Omahaw	shonka.
Osage	shankah.
English	*ten.*
Ioway	kræpana.
Winebago	kherapon.
Otto	krebenoh.
Konza	kerebrah.
Omahaw	krebera.
Osage	krabrah.

With the book in question Cass's vocabulary coincides.

	Hamilton and Irvine.	Cass.
fire	pæchæ	pedge.
water	ne	ni.
one	eyungkæ	iengki.
two	nowæ	noe.
three	tanye	tahni.
four	towæ	toe.
five	thata	satahng.
six	shagæ	shangwe.
seven	shahma	shahmong.
eight	krærææpane	krehebni.
nine	ksangkæ	shange.
ten	kræpanæ	krebnah.

2. "On the English Verb *do* and the Latin *da-re*, and on the Formation of the English Weak Perfects." By Professor Key.

The little syllables or letters which constitute the suffixes of language were no doubt originally possessed of as full a form as those syllables which are dignified by the name of root syllables, and were in fact themselves roots also. The degradation which they have suffered is readily accounted for by the two considerations, that when used as suffixes they are performing a secondary office, and also occupy that place in a word which is most likely to suffer by careless pronunciation. Under these circumstances it is nearly always a most difficult task to trace them up to their original form. But in the weak perfects of the Teutonic languages, such as our English *loved*, no such difficulty presents itself. So far as mere form is concerned, the process is complete with those who trace the *d* of this formation up to the weak perfects of the Anglo-Saxon in *de* and the Gothic in *ded*. That these syllables in reality form the suffixes of the perfect tenses here spoken of, is at once seen in a comparison with the perfects of the strong conjugations. Thus in Grimm's 'Deutsche Grammatik,' vol. i. pp. 840 and 845, we have the following skeletons of the two tenses for the Gothic :—

GOTHIC PRETERITES.

	Strong Conjugation.			Weak Conjugation.		
	1st pers.	2nd pers.	3rd pers.	1st pers.	2nd pers.	3rd pers.
Sing.	——	-t	——	-da	-dês	-da
Dual.	——	-uts	——	——	-dêduts	——
Plur.	-um	-uþ	-un.	-dêdum	-dêduþ	-dêdun.

Here a comparison of the duals and plurals at once points out the syllable *ded* as the distinguishing characteristic of the weak conjugation.

ANGLO-SAXON PRETERITES (Grimm, pp. 895, 903).

	Strong Conjugation.			Weak Conjugation.		
	1st pers.	2nd pers.	3rd pers.	1st pers.	2nd pers.	3rd pers.
Sing.	——	-e	——	-de	-dest	-de
Plur.	-on	-on	-on.	-don	-don	-don.

The singular is here a clearer guide than the plural, as it exhibits the suffix in the form *de* rather than *d* alone.

Grimm has pointed out (p. 1042), that this form *ded* bears a close resemblance to our modern auxiliary *did*, which performs the very same office; and there cannot be much hesitation in treating them as one and the same word, if there be found an independent origin for *did* itself. For it would be reasoning in a vicious circle if we considered *did* to be formed from *do*, with the same suffix which attaches itself to *loved*.

Now a theory proposed for consideration by the German scholar is to treat *did*, or rather *ded*, as a perfect of reduplication. This suggestion we believe to be more valid than its proposer implied.

That *did* was not formed on the principle of the weak conjugations seems to be determined by the suffix of the participle *done*. The German forms corresponding to *did* and *done* are *that* and *gethan*. Now of the one hundred and eighty-six irregular verbs in the German grammar there are fourteen which have a perfect participle in *t*, every one of which fourteen have the preterite of the indicative formed in *te*, while the one hundred and seventy-one verbs remaining have all their participles in *-en*, and of these not one forms its preterite in *te*. The probability that results from this combination seems to approach very nearly to certainty, but the antiquity of the verb *do* has other evidence in its favour. It is one of the very few verbs which have preserved the pronominal suffix in the first person of the indicative in several of the dialects. Thus the Old German (Grimm, p. 885) has for the singular of the indicative, *tuom, tuos, tuot*, and the Old Saxon (p. 894), *dón* or *dóm, dós, dód* or *dót*. Thus we are compelled to put our verb in the class of the most irregular, that is the oldest verbs of the language, just as *sum* and *inquam* claim a similar position in the Latin language for the same reason ; and *am* in our own tongue.

It might perhaps be argued on the other hand, that the perfects of *do* in the several Teutonic languages connect themselves with the weak verbs by their personal endings. For example, the Old German perfect in the first and third person is *tëta*, agreeing in the final letter with the weak verbs. So again, the Old Saxon is,—sing. 1. *dëda*; 2. *dëdôs*; 3. *dëda*; precisely like the termination of the weak perfects in that language, and differing in each of the three forms from the perfect of the strong verbs. But this argument is one which on examination will be found in our favour. It establishes, it must be admitted, only the more closely the connexion between the perfect *did* and the suffix of the weak perfects. But this similarity is accounted for on our theory just as well as on that which explains it by classing *do* among the weak verbs. If the weak verbs were actually formed by affixing the auxiliary *did*, then all the peculiarities of that verb would naturally go with it. Let it be observed too, that the personal endings of the perfects of weak verbs are more complete than those of the perfects of the strong verbs. For example, the *s* of the second person of the perfect is retained in the weak perfects of the Gothic and Old Saxon, although it has been lost in the strong perfects. Now it is commonly admitted that the more complete forms belong to the older formation. Our theory explains this; for we contend that *do* stands out among the strong or old verbs as one of the very oldest, and that the greater completeness of the personal endings of the perfects in the weak conjugations as compared with those of the strong conjugations is due solely to the great antiquity of the suffix.

But the doctrine that *did* is a perfect of reduplication is greatly strengthened by a comparison with the Latin *dedi*. It is true that an Englishman is at first startled at the idea of an English perfect being formed on the principle of reduplication, however ready to admit the doctrine in the classical languages. But the pages of Grimm's grammar would soon quiet his surprise by the exhibition of one hundred and twenty-six verbs in the Gothic whose perfects are so formed, and indeed with a closer observance of the principle than even the Latin. Thus from *hàit* call, we have the perfect *hàihàit*, which is more accurate than *momord-i* from *morde-o*, or *spopond-i* from *sponde-o*, or *scicid-i* from *scind-o*, or *stet-i* from *sta-re*.

The Anglo-Saxon it is true exhibits, as Grimm observes, but a faint trace of reduplication in *héht* (*jussit*) from *hâtan*, contracted probably from *héhét* (D. G. p. 898), while the general practice of this language is to distinguish the preterite by a modification of the vowel. Now it is difficult to suppose that a change in the internal structure of a word was ever an original mode of denoting a change of sense; it seems more probable that those changes called inflection or motion are at the outset the mere physical results that follow from the attachment of a suffix to a root; and as the changes depend upon the letters which constitute the suffix, they are in fact (to use a mathematical phrase) a function of those letters, and therefore in some measure calculated to represent and so supplant the suffix itself. In other cases two syllables are compressed into one, and under this principle it has often been proposed to explain the formation in Latin of the long vowel perfects, as though *fēc-i*, *ēg-i*, *verr-i* were reduced from reduplicated perfects *fefic-i*, *agig-i*, *veverr-i*. Now if this doctrine be admissible for the Latin, there seems little ground for rejecting it in Anglo-Saxon.

We have compared our English *did* from *do*, with the Latin *ded-i* from *da-re*, and we will now venture to go a step farther and assert the identity of the words both in form and meaning. We will take the question of form in the first place. Now the Latin *dare* is at once distinguished from the great mass of verbs in the *a* conjugation of the Latin language by its short quantity and its so-called irregularities. Among these irregularities none is more striking than the passage of its leading compounds into the third conjugation, as *abdĕre*, *condĕre*, &c. If these compounds be stripped of both prefix and infinitive-suffix, we have nothing left but the consonant *d*, which of course cannot be the whole of the root. The question is, what vowel followed that consonant? The infinitive *dăre* suggests *a*, while the old subjunctive *duim* pleads for *u*, and the Greek equivalents in *διδωμι*, *δοσις*, *-δοτος*, *δυτηρ*, *δωρον*, assert the right of the vowel, which in the vocal gamut* occupies the intermediate place, viz. *o*. The Latin *donum* supports this claim. Now it is remarkable that the same variety prevails in our own tongue and its kindred: we write an *o* in *do* and *done* and pronounce a *u*, while the German prefers *u* in the infinitive and present indicative, *a* in the preterite and perfect participle, as *thu,n*, *thu,e*, *that*, *gethan*. We may add that the Sanscrit is *dadá-mi*, the Lithuanian *dů-mi*, and the Old Slavic *damj*. (See Bopp's V. G., pp. 628, 629.)

Secondly, the meaning of the English *do* and the Latin *da* seems to have been originally the same, and to have answered to our English word *put*. To commence with the Latin. The idea of *to give* is not well suited for the primitive meaning of a word, if the conveyance of a title to possession be included in it; and if that notion be excluded, we have in fact nothing left but what is expressed by the very word *put*: *Do tibi in manum*, "I put into your hand." But the compounds of a word often retain a primitive meaning after the simple verb has lost it: accordingly, we have the meaning of the Latin *dare* most distinctly exhibited in its numerous compounds. We will take the monosyllabic prepositions in their alphabetic order, and observe the power of the root when compounded with them.

ab-dere, to hide; that is, put away, certainly not to give away.
ad-dere, to add; that is, put to.
con-dere, to build; that is, put together.
de-dere, to give up or surrender. (See below.)
di-dere munia, to distribute parts or offices.
e-dere, to utter; that is, put forth.
in-dere nomen, to affix or put a name on anything.
per-dere, to waste, destroy. (See below.)
ob-dere pessulum, to put the bar to, which fastens a door.
præ-ditus, endued with. (See below.)

---

* *i*, *e*, *a*, *o*, *u*. See Mr. Willis's paper, Cambr. Phil. Trans., vol. iii.

pro-dere, to put away, abandon, betray.
red-dere, to restore; that is, give or put back.
sub-dere calcar, to put up the spur to the horse.
trans-dere, to transfer.

The majority of these most distinctly exhibit a sense in agreement with the idea of *putting*, and at variance with that of a *gift*. A few still demand some words of explanation. *Dedere* is commonly translated by the phrase *give up*, but those who think that the word *give* tells against the present hypothesis, must be called on to justify the translation of *de* by what is just the contrary to its true signification, *up*. The truth is, that the idea commonly conveyed by this word is *the surrender of arms*, and the phrase *dedere arma* is more correctly translated by *laying down one's arms*. When a Roman soldier heard his opponent call for quarter, he did not go up to him while he had yet his sword or pike in hand, but expected him to throw that weapon down, that he might more safely make him his prisoner*. This done he approaches him: the latter, *dat manus*, "holds his hands behind him" to be bound, and the Roman, pulling a cord out of his pocket, binds them together. Hence perhaps the close connexion in form between *vincire* and *vincere*; and the derivatives from the former—*vinculum, vinxi, vinctus*—in deserting the *i* conjugation, bring the resemblance still nearer. The signification of "perdere" recedes as much from *giving* as from *putting*; but this word again will be found to afford the strongest evidence in favour of the connexion between the Latin and English verbs in question; for the prefix *per*, which gives to so many Latin words the idea of destruction,—as in *perire, perimere, perfidus, perjurare,*—is acknowledged to be the representative of the English *fore* or *for*, when used with the same sense as in our words *forswear, forbid, forget, forlorn*, and our old writers have preserved the compound *fordo* with precisely the sense of "perdere."

> This is the very extasie of love,
> Whose violent property fordoes itself.—Shaksp., Hamlet, II. 1.

The obsolete verb *prædere* would signify, on the present theory, "to put at the end" (compare *præustus, præacutus*), and might have been used in such a phrase as *prædere ferrum hastæ* (dat.), or by a change of construction very common in Latin, *prædere hastam ferro* (abl.), "to arm a shaft with an iron barb." The term "endued" with us is used only in a moral sense, and we know that the physical always preceded the metaphysical notion. Now the expression *armed* is well suited for metaphorical use in the same sense as *endued*. But there are still some compounds left. *Vendere* is one, as is proved by its perfect *ven-didi*, also by the longer form *venum-dăre*, which together correspond to *vēn-ire* and *vēnum-ire*; and it may be observed, that the compounds with *ire* are often used as passives by the side of the active compounds of *dare*. Thus we have just seen

---

* The phrase *sese dedere* may also be explained literally, "by throwing ourselves down at the feet of the conqueror."

perdere and *perire* corresponding to one another. Then as regards meaning, there is strong reason for suspecting that the words used in connexion with *venum* signify rather "exposure for sale" than "sale" itself. The translation of *venum ire* in Forcellini is, *esser esposto alla vendita*; and the word *venditare,* in its sense of "exhibiting," "setting off to advantage," supports the same doctrine. What the original meaning of *venum* itself was it is difficult to decide; but there seems to be no better solution of this difficulty than the conjecture that the noun *venus* or *venum* meant *window,* that is, the place where things for sale are ordinarily exposed. The very forms, too, of the words agree. As *men,* the radical syllable of *mens,* appears in English as *mind,* so *ven* would be *wind.* Moreover it is highly probable that the opening in a house called by the name of *window,* owes its name to the fact of its admitting *air* or *wind,* for in Italy at any rate the practice of glazing was not an early habit. The word *fen-estra* seems by its shape to have been at first a feminine adjective, and to have signified a something belonging to the window rather than the window itself. Its radical syllable *fen* bears a very strong resemblance to the *ven* with which we have been dealing. That *venum* is the accusative of a noun denoting the place or instrument of sale, seems certain from the phrase *venum ire**, for the original power of the accusative case was *motion to*: we ourselves talk of property going to the hammer; but the phrase *venum ire* also denotes the *offering* for sale rather than the sale itself.

We have another compound of *dare* in *credere,* as its perfect *credidi* and old subjunctive *cre-duim* unite in proving. Now "to believe" is a moral signification, and therefore not so likely to be the first sense of the word, as the idea of placing a valuable article with a person as a deposit for safe custody; and the construction, *Hoc tibi credo,* confirms this view. Thus the idea of *putting* is quite as visible in this word as that of *giving.*

Pessumdare and *circumdare* still remain. The first stands, according to the principle already spoken of, in connexion with *pessum ire,* and in *pessum* we have again the accusative of a noun whose signification is obscure. It is enough for our present purpose to say, that *dare* in *pessumdare* is virtually a facilitative of the *ire* in *pessum ire*; but the very word *to put* means *to cause to go.* Again: *circumdare,* both by its sense and by its construction, justifies our translation of *dare*; for *circumdare urbem muro* (abl.), "to surround a city with a wall," must be deemed a construction of later use than that of *circumdare urbi murum,* that is, "to put a wall round a city."

Before we leave the Latin language we must point attention to the two verbs *induo* and *exuo,* which one is tempted at first to divide so as to leave only *uo,* or rather *u,* for the simple verb, *ind* being the preposition; as in *ind-igeo, indu-perare, indi-gena.* But of such a verb there seems no other trace, and we have already had grounds for assigning a *u* to the early form of the verb *dare.* In this way *induere* has the sense of "putting on," and the early construction, *induere vestem alicui,* is explained. There is however something

---

* The dative *venui* also exists.

violent in the idea, that *ec-duere** should have been degraded into *ex-uere*. But if this alteration of form be considered not insuperable, then *exuere*, by its sense *to put off*, is another argument in confirmation of my doctrine. Nay, we might even claim the Greek verb *εκδυμι* as of similar origin.

We next proceed to our own tongue. One compound of *do*, viz. *fordo*, has already been dealt with. We have, besides this, *don* for "put on," *doff* for "put off," *douse* or *dout*† for "put out," with the familiar substantive *douters* for the extinguishing nippers. The practice of suffixing instead of prefixing prepositions to a verb, distinguishes our language from the Latin and most other languages. It of course makes little difference that the preposition is commonly printed apart from the verb, as in *put off*, *put on*, &c., the two words are pronounced as one. Indeed, in some of the provincial dialects we have such forms as *gout*, *goff*, for *go out*, *go off*.

Beyond our own language it will be perhaps sufficient to place together the following list of German words, the evidence of which is strongly confirmatory of what has been said:—

Ab-thun, *put away*.	Hin-thun, *put away*.
An-thun, *put on*.	Nach-thun, *copy*.
Auf-thun, *put up*, *open*.	Um-thun, *put round*.
Aus-thun, *put off* (exuo).	Weg-thun, *put away*.
Be-thun.	Zu-thun die augen, *to close*.
Ein-thun, *put in*.	Hervor-thun, *put forward* (sich).
Her-thun—hersetzen.	Ver-thun, *destroy*.

---

* We are justified in giving the preposition that form by the Greek *εκδιδωμι*, &c., *ecfugere*, *ecferare*, &c. Besides, the Bacchanalian inscription has EXDEICERE, i. e. *ech-deicere*, not *eks-dicere*, the X having its primitive power as in the Greek alphabet.

† To these may perhaps be added the verb *dup* for *do up*, one of the readings in Hamlet; "and dupt the chamber door."

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. FEBRUARY 14, 1845. No. 29.

P. I. CHABOT, Esq., in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table:

"Abyssinia; a Statement of Facts relative to Transactions between the Writer and the British Political Mission to the Court of Shoa," by C. T. Beke; presented by the Author. "The Phrenotypic Journal for 1842, 1843 and 1844," presented by Isaac Pitman, Esq.

The following gentlemen were elected Members of the Society:

Rev. John Jebb, M.A., Rector of Peterslow, near Ross, Herefordshire.
Henry Warburton, Esq.

A paper was then read:—

"On Mistakes in the Use of obsolete Greek Words by Attic Writers." By Professor Malden.

In any language which has a long existence, it is an event, not only possible, but almost certain to occur, that the etymology of some words will be forgotten, or the principle of some rare formation be lost sight of, and that false forms will be introduced according to some false analogy; and again, the meaning of some rare words used by old authors will be mistaken, and they will be used in a wrong sense by a modern writer. Thus in modern English we spell the words *sovereign* and *foreign*, as if their last syllable were connected with the noun *reign* derived from *regnum*; but Chaucer wrote *forain* or *foraine*, and Spenser wrote *soveraine*, and Milton *sovran*, in accordance with the French *souverain* and the Italian *sovrano*. Again, we spell *colleague* as if it were compounded from our word *league*, instead of coming to us at once from the Latin *collega*. As an example of mistakes in the meaning of words, we may mention the use which our newspaper writers make of the word *transpire*. They talk of a business or an event *transpiring*, when all they mean is, that the business was transacted or the event happened. In consequence of the familiar phrase "*is no more*," we sometimes see "*no more*" used as a synonymn for *dead*; and a certain newspaper article, on occasion of the death of George III., spoke of "the gloomy towers of Windsor, where our revered monarch lies *no more*."

But examples more serious, and more to our purpose, are errors committed by Lord Byron in 'Childe Harold,' in consequence of his affected imitation of ancient diction. Lord Byron having, it may be supposed, the word *ruthless* in his head, and not thinking of the meaning of the last syllable, in the first edition of 'Childe Harold' used *ruth* in the sense of *cruelty*. It was in his description of Ali Pacha:

> — those ne'er-forgotten acts of *ruth*,
> Beseeming all men ill, but most the man
> In years, that mark him with a tiger's tooth.—Canto ii. st. (63) 62.

The blunder was ridiculed in the 'Rejected Addresses,' though there the misuse of the word is less flagrant than in the original:

> Who can redeem from wretchedness and *ruth*
> Men true to falsehood's voice, false to the voice of truth?

The error was corrected in subsequent editions.

Lord Byron, apparently, had never seen, or did not remember, the phrase "kibed heels," which he might have found in old writers; but he had a vague recollection of Hamlet's remark, that "the toe of the peasant comes so near the heel of the courtier that he galls his kibe," and he fancied that *kibe* meant *heel*, instead of meaning a crack or chap in the skin of the heel, or a broken chilblain, and he describes a scene of mirth, in which

> Devices quaint and frolics ever new
> Tread on each other's *kibes* —Childe Harold, i. 67.

And this expression still stands in the poem.

These examples of error in the use of obsolete words are rather in caricature, but they will serve to indicate the general drift of the following remarks.

Similar phænomena are likely to present themselves in any language, the literature of which has existed long enough to allow words or forms of words to become obsolete. In Grecian literature we find a class of poets,—the learned poets of the Alexandrian period,—who set themselves to imitate the diction of the epic poets of the early ages. Apollonius Rhodius endeavoured to write in the language of Homer; but Apollonius and Homer were separated by more than six centuries; and it is not surprising that he should sometimes mistake the meaning of Homeric words, or, in venturing to imitate Homeric forms, fall into a false analogy. Several such errors might be pointed out in Apollonius, and Callimachus, and Theocritus; not merely instances in which the language in general use had suffered a change, but instances in which there is a real error, arising from the misapprehension or the mistaken ingenuity of the individual poet. This assertion probably will not startle classical scholars; but they are likely to be scandalized by the assertion, that even to the great Attic writers the language of the Homeric age was so different from their own that such mistakes were possible. This, however, seems to be the case in the use of a few words; and scholars are invited to consider the following instances.

In 'The Peace' of Aristophanes, when Trygæus has drawn up the goddess Peace from the bottom of the well in which she has been hidden for years, he is beset by the manufacturers of "the pomp and circumstance of glorious war," who revile him for spoiling their trades. And first a manufacturer of military crests complains, v. 1176,

οἴμοι ὡς προθέλυμνόν μ' ὦ Τρυγαῖ' ἀπώλεσας.

Προθέλυμνον is an Homeric word, the root of which is lost from the language, or, at least, is not obvious; and the meaning of it is to be determined from the sense of the context in the passages in which it occurs. There can be no question that in this line Aristophanes meant to make the Crest-maker say, "Alas! how utterly hast thou destroyed me, Trygæus!" and understood the word to mean literally, "torn up by the roots." The Scholiast on the passage says, *ὅ ἐστιν, ἄρδην ἀπώλεσάς με, τὴν εἰρήνην προξενήσας. φαίνεται δὲ καὶ οὗτος καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ τὸ προθέλυμνον ἀντὶ τοῦ πρόῤῥιζον ἀκούειν.* The rest of the Scholium I shall quote presently. Aristophanes has used the word elsewhere, and must be supposed to have given it the same sense. In the 'Knights,' v. 526, with a bold metaphor, or rather simile, he describes the torrent of wit and invective with which Cratinus, in the days of his popularity,

πολλῷ ῥεύσας ποτ' ἐπαίνῳ
διὰ τῶν ἀφελῶν πεδίων ἔῤῥει, καὶ τῆς στάσεως παρασύρων
ἐφόρει τὰς δρῦς καὶ τὰς πλατάνους καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς προθελύμνους.

Here also the Scholiast explains the word *προῤῥίζους*. And this meaning is caught up, hastily indeed, but not without a semblance of truth, from passages in Homer. Phœnix, in his description of the Calydonian boar (Il. I. 537), says,

πολλὰ δ' ὅγε προθέλυμνα χαμαὶ βάλε δένδρεα μακρὰ
αὐτῆσι ῥίζησι.

And again, in the description of the distress of Agamemnon at the beginning of book K (v. 15), it is said,

πολλὰς ἐκ κεφαλῆς προθελύμνους ἕλκετο χαίτας.

In both these passages, the translation, "up by the roots," would seem to give a sufficient sense, although in fact it would make the former passage tautological; and it is one of the explanations furnished by the Scholia of the Pseudo-Didymus. The Scholium on the latter passage, indeed, tries to furnish an etymology, and adds, *Θέλυμνα δὲ κυρίως οἱ θεμέλιοι*; but the etymology is invented out of the supposed meaning. *Θέλυμνον* is not to be found as a separate word, not in this sense at least, and is made identical with *θεμέλιον* by such transpositions and changes as the Greek etymologers seem fond of imagining, but which the truth of language refuses to recognise. The process however is plain by which, from these passages of Homer, Aristophanes might deduce the meaning which he has given to the word *προθέλυμνος*; and it is likely enough that other careless readers of Homer in his day did the same, as we find from the Scholia and modern commentaries and lexicons (*e.g.* Schrevelius) that many others have done since.

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that this is a false interpretation of the word. The error was pointed out long ago by the prince of ancient critics, Aristarchus; for the Scholiast on the passage in 'The Peace' goes on, after the remarks quoted before, to say, Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ τὸ συνεχὲς καὶ ἄλλο ἐπ' ἄλλῳ δηλοῦσθαι φησί: and that acute scholar quoted the passages from Homer, which are decisive evidence of the true meaning. In N. 130 we read that a select body of the bravest of the Greeks awaited the attack of Hector and the Trojans,

φράξαντες δόρυ δουρὶ, σάκος σάκεϊ προθελύμνῳ.

The description goes on,

ἀσπὶς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ·
ψαῦον δ' ἱππόκομοι κόρυθες λαμπροῖσι φάλοισι
νευόντων· ὣς πυκνοὶ ἐφέστασαν ἀλλήλοισι.

Here it is plain that προθελύμνῳ must mean "overlying," "lying one on the other." And the meaning is made yet more clear, if possible, by the occurrence of another compound from the same root. In O. 479, where Teucer drops his bow, and arms himself with the usual arms of a warrior, we are told,

αὐτὰρ ὅγ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι σάκος θέτο τετραθέλυμνον;

and the line is repeated with little difference in Od. χ. 122,

αὐτὸς δ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι σάκος θέτο τετραθέλυμνον.

Τετραθέλυμνον can mean nothing but "overlaid fourfold," or "covered with four layers" of hide and metal; and so Aristarchus explained it, τουτέστι, τέσσαρας ἐπ' ἀλλήλων ἔχον πτύχας; and the same explanation is given in the common Scholia.

Now then, if we go back to the passages of Homer which we cited first, and apply to them the interpretation of προθέλυμνος which we have gained from the latter passages, we shall find that it suits them perfectly. In I. 537,

πολλὰ δ' ὅγε προθέλυμνα χαμαὶ βάλε δένδρεα μακρὰ
αὐτῇσι ῥίζῃσι,

the trees are described as thrown to the ground "one upon another;" and in K. 15,

πολλὰς ἐκ κεφαλῆς προθελύμνους ἕλκετο χαίτας,

Agamemnon pulls out his hair by handfuls; literally, "many hairs out of his head one upon another pulled he."

This meaning then, which suits all the passages, suiting even the one first quoted much better than the common interpretation, πρόρριζος, or "up by the roots," inasmuch as it expresses a different idea from αὐτῇσι ῥίζῃσι, and does not make Homer guilty of tautology, and which moreover is consistent with the use of τετραθέλυμνον, this is the true meaning; and Aristophanes was deceived by too hasty an induction, and has used the word in a false sense.

The true interpretation, as well as the false one, is given in the Scholia on Homer (*e. g.* on I. 537, πρόρριζα· ἐπάλληλα καὶ πυκνά). We find also, that though προθέλυμνος in its ordinary use was obsolete, yet either the adjective itself, or perhaps its root, remained in use as a technical term in the management of fruit trees; and this technical use might have guided any Athenian who knew it to the true meaning of the Homeric epithet. The Scholiast on N. 130, explains *προθελύμνῳ* by *πυκνῷ*, and adds, *Ἀνδρόμαχος ἐν Ἐτυμολογικοῖς φησὶ κυρίως λέγεσθαι τὰ ἐπαλλήλους κλαδοὺς ἔχοντα δένδρα, διὰ τὸ θηλυμανεῖν*. The derivation is good for nothing except to show what Niebuhr calls "that extreme spirit of absurdity which always came over even the most sagacious of the Greeks and Romans the moment they meddled with etymology."

The technical use is given also in the 'Etymologicum Magnum,' perhaps on the same authority: *θέλυμνα λέγεται τὰ ἐπαλλήλως ἔχοντα τοὺς κλαδοὺς δένδρα.*

In the fragments of Empedocles (vv. 73 and 139), the simple adjective *θέλυμνος* appears to be used. In both passages the MS. of Simplicius, who has preserved the fragments in his 'Commentaries upon Aristotle,' has *θέλιμνα*, but *θέλυμνα* is a probable correction. The first passage seems to be corrupt. The second passage is

ἐν τῇ δὴ (that is, *ἐν Φιλότητι*, the Empedoclean allegory for the chemical principle of affinity)

> *ἐν τῇ δὴ τάδε πάντα συνέρχεται ἓν μόνον εἶναι,*
> *οὐκ ἄφαρ, ἀλλὰ θέλυμνα συνίσταται ἄλλοθεν ἄλλο.*

It appears that *θέλυμνα* here is used in the true sense of *προθέλυμνος* in Homer, viz. "one upon another," or "cumulatively."

Before we proceed to another passage, in which it seems that a word of the older language has been mistaken, it will be well to examine the family of words to which the argument relates.

The adjective *ἕκηλος* belonged to the old poetical language, and continued to be used by the later poets in succession, although, as we do not find it in prose, we may conclude that it became obsolete in the common spoken language. Theocritus applies it to persons in the sense of "inactive, idle" (Id. xxv. 100); and Apollonius uses it to describe the stillness of inanimate objects (iii. 969). But Buttmann, in his 'Lexilogus,' has shown that these uses are erroneous; and that in Homer and Pindar (and he might have added, in the tragedians also) the word is applied exclusively to persons; and in the Iliad and Odyssey and by Pindar it is used to signify "quiet" or "tranquil," in the sense of "undisturbed," "at one's pleasure," "according to one's will," so that it is applicable not only to persons in a state of repose, but to persons actively exerting themselves, if not opposed or interrupted. Thus in Il. Z. 70, Nestor exhorts the Greeks not to lose the opportunity of victory by throwing themselves on the spoils of the slain,

> *ἀλλ' ἄνδρας κτείνωμεν· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἕκηλοι*
> *νεκροὺς ἀμ πέδιον συλήσετε τεθνειῶτας.*

Again, in P. 340, Hector exhorts the Trojans not to suffer the Greeks to rescue the dead body of Patroclus:

τῷ ῥ' ἰθὺς Δαναῶν ἴομεν, μηδ' οἵ γε ἕκηλοι
Πάτροκλον νηυσὶν πελασαίατο τεθνειῶτα.

The tragedians, as has been observed, apply the word only to persons; and Sophocles does not depart from the Homeric meaning. In Elect. 786, he uses it as an adverb, but still, although the construction is different, the meaning is the same:

— — νῦν δ' ἕκηλά που,
τῶν τῆσδ' ἀπειλῶν οὕνεχ', ἡμερεύσομεν.

The word does not appear in Euripides. Æschylus uses it once, and departs from the Homeric usage, making ἕκηλος ἴσθι signify "be still." Sept. c. Th. 220. ἕκηλος ἴσθι, μηδ' ἄγαν ὑπερφοβοῦ.

It is plain, both from the form and the sense (and this also Buttmann has pointed out), that ἕκηλος has a common root with the adjective ἑκών, "willing," and ἕκητι (in the later Greek ἕκατι), which is commonly called a preposition, but which is more probably in origin a noun, and which in Homer is joined only with a genitive case of persons, and signifies "by the will of." In ἕκ-ηλος, ηλος is an adjective termination, as in ὑψηλός, ὑδρηλός, σιγηλός (on the difference of accent see Buttmann); and ἐκ is the common root of ἕκηλος, ἑκών, and ἕκητι.

It is clear in Homer that ἕκηλος has lost an initial consonant. The word occurs nineteen times: in fourteen of these passages the metre requires an initial consonant to prevent hiatus; in one it admits it, the preceding word being merely a dative case with a paragogic ν (ἐν μεγάροισιν ἕκηλοι, Od. π. 314); and three of the remaining four may be very easily corrected*. It appears by a similar argument that ἑκών and ἕκητι have lost an initial consonant, and also by their being compounded with the negative α, and not with the fuller form αν, in ἀέκων and ἀέκητι. What the lost consonant was, whether Ϝ (vau) or σ, is not so manifest; but the evidence which there is to determine the point is for the vau. It is well-known that in the glossary of Hesychius there are many words spelt with a gamma (γ), in which the γ represents an ancient Ϝ (probably by the same process by which the French *garde* and the English *ward* are connected, and *gimblet* and *wimble*). Now in Hesychius occurs the gloss, Γέγκαλον, ἥσυχον; but it has been well pointed

---

* Il. Θ, 512, μὴ μὰν ἀσπουδί γε νεῶν ἐπιβαῖεν ἕκηλοι.
It will be seen by reference to the context, that the laws of syntax require the subjunctive mood, ἐπιβῶσι Ϝέκηλοι. The contracted form of the verb is borne out by Od. ξ. 86,

— οἵτ' ἐπὶ γαίης
ἀλλοτρίης βῶσιν.

Od. ρ, 478, ἔσθι' ἕκηλος, ξεῖνε, —: read ἔσθε Ϝέκηλος.

In Od. φ, 289, οὐκ ἀγαπᾷς ὃθ' ἕκηλος ὑπερφιάλοισι μεθ' ἡμῖν
δαίνυσαι,
ὃ ἕκηλος (i. e. ὃ Ϝέκηλος) has been restored already.

The passage, Od. β. 311, is rather more difficult:

δαίνυσθαί τ' ἀκέοντα, καὶ εὐφραίνεσθαι ἕκηλον.

Perhaps εὐφραίνεσθ' εὔκηλον.

out by Mr. Donaldson (New Cratylus, p. 131) that the second γ in γέγκαλον is due to an error of transcription, because the word stands in alphabetical arrangement after the word γειώρας. We are left therefore with γέκαλον, which will be a dialectic form of ϝέκηλος. The next word γεκαθά, which is interpreted ἑκοῦσα, is probably corrupt; but it points in like manner to a F in the old form of the root ἑκ.

We are now prepared to consider another form, εὔκηλος. Εὔκηλος is exactly synonymous with ἕκηλος; and it was to show more clearly this identity of meaning that Buttmann's remarks on the signification of ἕκηλος were quoted. The form εὔκηλος, in like manner, is used by the Alexandrian poets in the sense of "silent," or "still," and extended to inanimate objects; by the tragic poets, with whom it is rare *, applied only with reference to persons (strictly as an adjective by Sophocles, ξυνναίοιμ' εὔκηλος, Elect. 241; adverbially by Euripides, ὡς οὐ βλέπεις εὔκηλον, Iph. A. 634); but in Homer used with the peculiar meaning of ἕκηλος. Thus in Il. P. 371. we are told, that while the warriors who fought around the dead body of Patroclus were enveloped in a thick mist, which impeded their exertions,

> οἱ δ' ἄλλοι Τρῶες καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ
> εὔκηλοι πολέμιζον ὑπ' αἰθέρι.

The Scholiasts and the Gloss writers acknowledge with one voice the identity of the words. The author of the 'Etymologicum Magnum,' for example, although he resorts to strange etymological devices to explain the connexion of the two forms, does not suggest for εὔκηλος any derivation which should separate it from ἕκηλος. The learned grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus states expressly, "that εὔκηλος is related to ἕκηλος in the same way as εὖτε to ὅτε" (New Cratylus, p. 354), whatever he conceived that way to be.

The υ in the diphthong in εὔκηλος represents the F in the other form ϝέκηλος. Buttmann thought that ε was prefixed to ϝέκηλος, as it is to many other words beginning with F, as ἐϝείκοσι, ἐϝῖσος, ἐϝέδνα, and that ἐϝέκηλος was shortened into ἔϝκηλος or εὔκηλος. The objection to this hypothesis is, that in all the other instances the syllable to which ε is prefixed is long; and the dwelling of the voice upon the syllable seems the essential condition of its being introduced by a short vowel sound prefixed to it. We may rather consider the relation between ἕκηλος and εὔκηλος, or the change from ϝέκηλος to ἔϝκηλος, as a mere transposition. Perhaps there is no example precisely similar: but there are many examples of transposition in the opposite direction, when the F has become a mere aspiration. Thus ἔϝαδε, the second aorist from the root ϝαδ, is represented in Homer by εὔαδε, the first syllable being long; but in Herodotus it is ἕαδε, the aspiration being transferred from the root to the augment. The aspiration in ἑάλων has the same origin. The name of the god of the

---

* In the passage which we cited from Æschylus, Sept. 220, ἕκηλος ἴσθι, μηδ' ἄγαν ὑπερφοβοῦ, the older editions have εὔκηλος, and the MSS. vary between the two.

invisible world is manifestly derived from the root *ϝιδ*, *see*, and was originally 'Αϝίδης, but by contraction it becomes Ἀΐδης. Eustathius, in his commentary on Il. A. 554, observes that the connexion between ἔκηλος and εὔκηλος is like that between the Attic noun ὅρος, *boundary*, and the Ionic form οὖρος, which is not aspirated.

Such is the origin of the syllable ευ; and the fact of the connexion between the two forms was so clear, whatever difficulty there might be in explaining it, that, as Buttmann has observed, none of the ancient grammarians thought of separating them by treating εὔκηλος as compounded from the adverb εὖ. Independently of the connexion with ἔκηλος, there is a difficulty in supposing the word to be so compounded, because there is no root which accounts satisfactorily for the second part of the word. It could not be said to be compounded from κηλέω, *to soothe* or *charm*; the verbal compound could be nothing but εὐκήλητος: but even if we imagine the existence of some lost noun, from which κηλέω and εὔκηλος might both be derived, the derivation is inadmissible on account of the incongruity of meaning. The verb κηλέω is not found in Homer; but the noun κηληθμός occurs twice in descriptions of the effect of the narrative of Ulysses on the listening Phæacians:

ὣς ἔφαθ'· οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ,
κηληθμῷ δ' ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα.—λ. 334. ν. 2.

This notion is utterly alien from the meaning of εὔκηλος in the passage already cited,

εὔκηλοι πολέμιζον ὑπ' αἰθέρι,

or in the expostulation of Juno with Jupiter in Il. A. 554,

ἀλλὰ μάλ' εὔκηλος τὰ φράζεαι ἅσσ' ἐθέλῃσθα.

But although grammarians and critics did not think of composition with the adverb εὖ, the authority of Æschylus is on the other side of the question. In the 'Eumenides,' after the disappointed Furies have twice uttered imprecations upon the land of Attica, Pallas says to them (vv. 788, 789),

Οὐκ ἔστ' ἄτιμοι, μηδ' ὑπερθύμως ἄγαν
θεαὶ βροτῶν στήσητε δύσκηλον χθόνα.

The word δύσκηλος does not occur elsewhere; but it is impossible to read this passage without feeling that Æschylus intended it to be the opposite of εὔκηλος, and therefore must have conceived εὔκηλος to be compounded from εὖ. Scholars must judge whether the critical and etymological arguments which have been adduced are sound; but if they are, then Æschylus was mistaken in the etymology of εὔκηλος, and made a new compound upon a false analogy.

A word has been mentioned incidentally in the foregoing discussion, the more exact investigation of which will lead us to the consideration of a second word, which has been used by Æschylus in an unusual sense. The word ἕκητι in Homer signifies "by the will," or "by the good will or favour," and is joined with the genitive case of persons only. In Od. ο. 318, we have Ἑρμείαο ἕκητι; in τ. 86, Ἀπόλλωνός γε ἕκητι; and in υ. 42, Ulysses says to Pallas,

εἴπερ γὰρ κτείναιμι Διός τε σέθεν τε ἕκητι,
πῇ κεν ὑπεκπροφύγοιμι;

From the form and the meaning of ἕκητι it is obvious that it was originally the dative case of a noun; but that it had ceased to be so considered is also manifest from its being compounded with the negative α, and our having ἀέκητι, signifying "against the will of," "in despite of," as in Il. Λ. 666, Ἀργείων ἀέκητι, and θεῶν ἀέκητι in O. 720. This word also is used only with persons. The use and signification of ἕκητι is the same in Hesiod and in the Homeric Hymns, in a votive inscription of Simonides (72. Gaisf.), and in a fragment of Archilochus, except that in the last passage θεῶν ἕκητι means merely "by the will of the gods," where the object willed is the infliction of suffering:

ἄψυχος, χαλεπῇσι θεῶν ὀδύνησιν ἕκητι
πεπαρμένος δι' ὀστέων.

This then is the ancient use of the word; but the later poets apply it to denote, not merely the will of an agent, but any species of cause, as if it signified merely "on account of," and were synonymous with ἕνεκα, and so join it with any noun. Thus in Pindar we have ἕκατι στεφάνων (Pyth. x. 58), ἕκατι ποδῶν (Nem. viii. 47): in Æschylus we have in the Persæ (v. 309) πλήθους ἕκατι; in the Agamemnon (v. 848),

τοιῶνδ' ἕκατι κληδόνων παλιγκότων,

and other similar passages; and again others in Sophocles, and very many in Euripides, who seems fond of the word: for example, in Med. 1225, γάμων ἕκατι τῶν Ἰάσονος, and in Iph. Aul. 483,

ἢ τῶν ἐμῶν ἕκατι θύεσθαι γάμων
μέλλει.

Now in this case the word was not current indeed in the language of common life, but it seems to have been always in familiar use with the poets; and although it changed its meaning, and the earliest extant example of the innovation is the first passage quoted from Pindar, yet it would be very rash to single out Pindar as the author of the change, and to impute to him in particular a misconception or a neglect of the Homeric usage.

There is however another word in Homer which is very nearly synonymous with ἕκητι, and that is the word ἰότητι. It occurs frequently in the phrase θεῶν ἰότητι and in some others; with a singular noun as well as with a plural, as κακῆς ἰότητι γυναικός (Od. λ. 383). It signifies, "by the purpose," "by the device," "by the contrivance"; and it differs from ἕκητι by expressing less of inclination and more of the purpose of the understanding. A passage, which at first sight may seem a little different, is really in accordance with this interpretation:

οὐ μέντοι ξείνου γε καὶ Ἴρου μῶλος ἐτύχθη
μνηστήρων ἰότητι. (Od. σ. 232.)

"the fray of the stranger and Irus was not however shaped by the purpose of the suitors," but turned out differently from what they intended. The word is used in the same sense in the Homeric Hymns to Apollo and to Venus (Ap. v. 484, Ven. v. 167).

'Ιότητι even more plainly than ἕκητι is the dative case of a noun. The stem of it has the form of an abstract noun of quality. In one instance, and one only, another case is used. In Il. O. 41, Juno protests,

> μὴ δι' ἐμὴν ἰότητα Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων,
> πημαίνει Τρῶάς τε καὶ Ἕκτορα, τοῖσι δ' ἀρήγει.

With the exception of a fragment of Alcæus, and of the passage of Æschylus, to which these remarks are to be applied, the word does not occur in any intermediate poet, till we come to Apollonius Rhodius. Alcæus has θεῶν ἰότατι (fr. 69. Mus. Crit.). Apollonius uses it, not strictly according to Homeric precedent, but without any wide departure from it as to sense, treating it as an ordinary noun synonymous with βουλή.

In the Prometheus of Æschylus, the chorus, after dwelling on the hopelessness of the sufferings of Prometheus, continue thus:

> το διαμφίδιον δέ μοι μέλος προσέπτα,
> τόδ', ἐκεῖνό θ' ὅ τ' ἀμφὶ λοετρὰ
> καὶ λέχος σὸν ὑμεναίουν
> ἰότατι γάμων, ὅτε τὰν ὁμοπάτριον
> ἕδνοις ἄγαγες 'Ησιόναν
> πιθὼν δάμαρτα κοινόλεκτρον.

The Bishop of London in his glossary on this passage translates the word "*lætitia,*" but gives no authority or reason for his interpretation. Mr. Linwood in his Lexicon to Æschylus arrives at the same interpretation. He says, "'Ιότης, *will, pleasure*; ἰότητι γάμων, P. V. 557, *in pleasure at the marriage.*" There is ground for a suspicion that Mr. Linwood's process is a play upon words; that he translates θεῶν ἰότητι, "by the will of the gods," "at the pleasure of the gods," and so makes ἰότης mean "pleasure." But, though "by the will of the gods" would be a tolerable translation, "at the pleasure of the gods" would be a false one, and even if it were correct would not prove that ἰότης meant "pleasure." Mr. Linwood, at the end of his article, observes truly, after Passow, that "this dative is much the same in sense as the word ἕκητι:" and it seems probable that the true explanation of the passage is, that Æschylus conceived ἰότητι to be altogether synonymous with ἕκητι, and so gave to the word the same sense which the incorrect usage of the post-Homeric poets had given to ἕκατι; and that by ἰότατι γάμων he meant nothing more than "on account of your marriage." This perversion of the word, which has no precedent and has found no imitator, is clearly a different thing from using ἕκατι in a way which the general practice of the later poets sanctioned, and which was in fact a change in poetical language, like the changes which take place in common spoken language. Æschylus's use of ἰότατι must be considered either as an error, or as an intentional innovation: either he did not perceive that the recent poets used ἕκατι, and that he himself was using ἰότατι, in a sense which was not the sense of the words in the older language; or he purposely, but unsuccessfully, attempted to attach a new meaning to the word.

Another error may be noticed, which is an error in spelling, like that pointed out in our own language in the words *foreign* and *sovereign*; and probably therefore it is not to be charged on the poet but only on his transcribers. In our text of Sophocles in the Œdipus in Colonus, v. 349, Œdipus describes Antigone as

> — *πολλὰ μὲν κατ' ἀγρίαν*
> *ὕλην ἄσιτος νηλίπους τ' ἀλωμένη,*

and the reading is old; for the word *νηλίπους*, spelt in the same manner, occurs in Suidas's Lexicon, with the interpretation *ἀνυπόδητος*, *shoeless* or *barefoot*; and this is the true meaning of the word. But if *νηλίπους* is supposed to be compounded in a similar way to *barefoot*, *πους* indeed, is *foot*, but the other part of the compound is utterly inexplicable. The true spelling is *νήλιπος*. In Apoll. Rhod. iii. 646. we have *νήλιπος, οἰέανος*; and in Theocrit. Id. iv. 56. we find the good advice,

> *εἰς ὄρος ὄκχ' ἕρπῃς, μὴ ἀνάλιπος ἔρχεο, Βάττε·*
> *ἐν γὰρ ὄρει ῥάμνοι τε καὶ ἀσπάλαθοι κομόωντι.*

And the scholiast explains the word and gives the etymology: *ἤγουν ἀνυπόδητος· ἦλιψ γὰρ τὸ ὑπόδημα.* *Ἀνήλιπος* and *νήλιπος*, therefore, are formed from *ἦλιψ* by the usual negative prefix, and an adjectival termination is added, as in *γοργωπός* and other derivatives from *ὦψ*. The syllable *πος* has been transformed into *πους* by some one who was ignorant of the etymology, and strove to put some meaning into the word, or give it an appearance of analogy to known compounds. This change might be made the more readily, because in Homeric Greek there were true compounds of *πoῦς* in which the last syllable appeared as *πος*,—a spelling, it may be observed, strictly in accordance with the laws of the language,—but which, by the custom of later times, would have been made to end in *πους*. Thus in Il. Θ. 409. we have, *ὦρτο δὲ Ἶρις ἀέλλοπος ἀγγελέουσα*, where a later poet would have said *ἀελλόπους*. However, as was said before, it is doubtful whether Sophocles wrote *νηλίπους* by the false analogy, or whether the error is due merely to transcribers.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. FEBRUARY 28, 1845. No. 30.

P. J. CHABOT, Esq. in the Chair.

A paper was read—

"On the Use of the Collective Noun in English Syntax." By Edwin Guest, Esq.

In the earlier stages of our language, words of a general and indefinite meaning seem to have taken the neuter as their appropriate gender; and as the change was easy from a general to a collective sense, the names of such objects as present themselves to our notice in their aggregate were also for the most part neuter: *gærs* grass, *heg* hay, *blod* blood, &c. We have already* seen, that when a mere general reference was intended, the neuter pronoun *it* was used not only as the representative of the singular pronouns *he* and *she*, but also of the plural *they*.

A large proportion of Anglo-Saxon neuters have the nominative plural the same as the nominative singular; and a great number of these nouns are the names of things which are generally viewed collectively: *leaf* leaf, *ear* ear of corn, *æg* egg, *ban* bone, *god* goods, *reaf* garment, *fæt* vessel, &c. It is not improbable that *primarily* these terms had a general and collective meaning, and were made to designate individual objects, chiefly by their construction with words indicating unity. Other languages have obtained their name for the individual by adding a suffix to the collective term; thus the Welsh adds a diminutive ending, and from *moch* hogs, *pysgod* fishes, *blew* hair, *gwelt* straw, &c., forms *mochyn* a hog, *pysgodyn* a fish, *blewyn* a hair, &c. The Anglo-Saxon nouns *wif* woman, *bearn* bairn, *cild* child, &c. may have been treated as neuters, because the women and children of a family were from motives of delicacy referred to in general terms. In the East it is still considered an indecorum to mention the individual members of the harem; both Turk and Arab always inquire after their neighbour's "house."

In modern English the collective noun is generally preceded by the definite article, and is sometimes construed with a plural verb, "the enemy were routed." In our provinces it is still often used without the article:—

1. — th' grit foulin did'nt ken what *havercake* wor—Noa barn he teuk *em* &c. for round bits o' leather.—Cars Craven Dial. 300.

This idiom was once common, and it seems to have been gradually driven from our written language, as being hardly consistent with that precision which is ever the first object of the prose-writer. Poetry loves the indefinite; and general terms and idioms, which

---

* See vol. i. p. 154.

must have taken root in the very infancy of our language, were long preserved in our Anglo-Saxon and Old-English poems. In Anglo-Saxon poetry we find nouns of all the genders treated as plurals, and construed with plural verbs and plural adjectives, though they do not take the plural inflexions. This syntax seems to have originated in the same principle, which (as we have conjectured) gave birth to the neuter declension. The natural gender of the noun would probably be retained or give place to the neuter, accordingly as the noun was most used in its singular or collective signification:

2. — *mægð siðedon.*
fæmnan and wuduwan. freondum beslegene.
from hleow-stole. *hettend læddon.*
út mid æhtum. Abrahames mæg.

— the maidens departed,
Damsels and widows, shorn of their friends,
From his place of refuge, the spoiler led
Out with his goods Abraham's kinsman. Cæd. 94.

3. Ðær æfter him. folca þryðum.
Sunu Simeones. sweotum *comon.*

There after them in peopled bands,
The sons of Simeon came in crowds. Cæd. 160.

4 — him on laste *setl.*
wuldor spedum welig. wide *stodan.*
gifum grówende. on godes rice.
beorht and geblædfast. buendra leas.

— on their hinder path,
Rich with glories, their seats stood widely,
(With riches flourishing, within God's realm
Bright and precious)—void of habitants. Cæd. 5.

5. *eodon* ða sterced ferhðe *hæleð.*

Went the stern-hearted heroes. Judith.

An adjective connected with the noun was sometimes put in the singular number, as in ex. 4, and sometimes in the plural, as in ex. 5.

An imperfect acquaintance with this idiom seems to have led Grimm into a serious error, which English writers have too hastily adopted. According to this grammarian (D. G. i. 647), masculine nouns of the first "strong declension" sometimes threw away their plural ending *as*, so that *hæleth* might stand for *hælethas*. But this hypothesis is too narrow for its object. It is true that masculine nouns forming their plural in *as* are mostly used in the construction we have been considering, but they are not used exclusively. In the examples above quoted, *mægð* is feminine and has *mægða* for its plural; *setl* is neuter and has *setlu*; and *sunu*, though masculine, forms its plural in *a*, *suna*.

In our Old-English poetry the collective noun was used even more frequently than in the Anglo-Saxon.

6. — toke he þe croune
And purveied parlement of *erle* and *baroun.* R. Br. 26.

7. Of *knyȝt* no *squier* bold on liue non thei left. R. Br. 117.

8. Þe brouht kyng Athelstan *present* withouten pere. R. Br. 30.

9. Darie the soudan, maister of *kyng*,
Is strongly anoied of this tidyng. K. Alis. 1918.

10. Noe my freend I thee command—
A ship that thou ordand of *nayle & bord* ful well.
Townl. Myst. 23.

and in this stage of our language it is even found coupled with ordinary plural nouns.

11. And there michel wel geslogon *ge Norweis*[*], *ge Fleming.*
And there great slaughter made they, both of Norways and Flemming.
S. Chron. A.D. 1066.

12. Þo heo were þorȝout y mengd *with swerdes and with mace,*
Mid axe[†] and mid aules so muche folk in þat place
Me slew þat, &c. R. Gl. 26.

13. Þe route of þare rascaille he did it rere and ryme,
Normanz and Flemmyng taile he kutted many time. R. Br. 71.

14. Valerian goth home and fint Cecilie
Within his chaumbre, with an angell stonde.
This angel had *of roses and of lilie*
Corones two. Chau. Seconde Nonnes Tale.

15. The heraudes left hir pricking up and down,
Now ringen *trompes loud and clarioun.* Chau. Kn. Tale, 2603.

16. That hed was on the gate y set
With *trompes, tabours and cornet.* Oct. 1190.

17. Thanne hem kiste *kynges and knyght,*
Erlys, barons and ladyys bryght. Oct. 1945.

When a noun, indicating something which belongs to an individual, is joined in construction with a genitive plural, or with some substitute for such genitive—for example, with one of the possessive pronouns, *our, your, their,*—the present usage of our language requires that such noun should also be in the plural number: *the men's bodies, their heads,* &c. At an earlier period the singular noun was generally used in this syntax.

18. —hi geopnedon *ealne*[‡] *heora muð* for leahtre.
—they opened all their mouth for wickedness.
Paris Psalter, 34. 21.

19. —me dide cnotted strenges abuton *here hæued.*
—they put knotted strings about their heads.
Sax. Chron. 1137.

20. Much they (*i. e.* women) desireth to shewe *heore body,*
Heore faire heir, heore faire rody,
To have los and praising. K. Alisander.

---

[*] *Norweis* must represent the Anglo-Saxon plural *Norwægas.*

[†] *Axe* in this place may possibly be the feminine plural.

[‡] *Ealne* has been corrected by the editor into *ealle.*

21. Ye dainty nymphs that in this blessed brook
Do bathe *your breast*,
Forsake your watery bowers, and hither look
At my request. Spens. April.

22. — *our soul* is brought low, even unto the dust; *our belly* cleaveth unto the ground.—Ps. 44. Com. Prayer.

23. So underneath *the belly of their steeds*,
The noble gentleman gave up the ghost. 3 Hen. VI. 2. 3.

Still more frequently do we find the singular noun taking a collective sense in construction with one of the numerals. This idiom is to be met with in almost every one of the existing Gothic dialects. In our own language it may be traced from the time of the Anglo-Saxons to the present day. The phrase *twegen fætels*, from which Grimm draws the inference that Anglo-Saxon nouns in *els* sometimes discard the plural ending *as* (D. G. i. 639), is clearly an instance of it.

24. —he mette in the see
Þritti schipful of men. R. Glou. 39.

25. *Four and twenty winter** lasted this sorrow. R. Br. 40.

26. *Þritty thousand pounde* vnto Suane he sent
Þes to haf. R. Br. 41.

27. He bare a schafte that was grete and strong,
It was *fourtene foot* long. R. C. de Lion, 287.

28. —thou schalt pay ransoun
For the and thy *twoo baroun*. R. C. de Lion, 1150.

29. In *twenty manere* coud he trip and dance. Ch. Milleres Tale.

After the beast had marcht some *twenty pace*,
He sudden stops. Sylv. Du Bartas, 6th day.

Instead of the numeral we sometimes have one of the adjectives, *many*, *fele*, *sere*, *divers*, &c.

30. —as he sat at mete and *mony oþer kynȝt* also. R. Gl. 284.

31. Knight and erl and *mani baroun*
Kiste the emperours sonn. Seuyn Sages, 429.

32. He fleygh away fro toun to toun,
Thorough *mony strong regioun*. K. Alis. 123.

33. Þe bataile of Troie þat laste *fele ȝer*,
Many was þe gode body þat y slawe was þer. R. Glou. 9.

34. Ten orders in heven were,
Of angels that had *office sere*. Townl. Myst. 7.

35. I have him sent
Of many beestes *sere present*. Townl. Myst. 47.

36. He was a man of myghty hond,
With him broughte of *divers lond*,
Nyne and twenty ryche kynges,
To make on him bataylinges. K. Alis. 97.

---

* According to Rask, the Anglo-Saxon noun *winter* remains unchanged in its nominative plural. But it may perhaps be doubted, if he had any other authority for this statement than phrases like that in the text. Such phrases are common in Anglo-Saxon, but of course prove nothing.

In some of our provincial dialects we find the numeral and its noun treated as if they formed a compound term: "I have not seen him these *two seven years*."—Forby. These idioms may be traced to the Old-English:

37. Aboute *an thre wouke* there he gan bide. R. Gl. 545.

38. Ac kyng Wyllam þer byuore aboute *an tuo ȝer*,
Wende agen to Normandye. R. Gl. 368.

39. — this my posture,
Wherein *this three year* I have milked their hopes. B. Jons. 1.2.

40. — no tonge may devise,
Though that I might *a thousand winter* tell,
The peines of thilke cursed hous of hell. Chau. Freres Tale.

41. Dorchester—that besyde Oxenford ys,
As in the Est South *an sene myle* y wys. R. Gl. 247.

42. Within *this three mile* you may see it coming,
A moving grove. Macbeth.

43. For *a thousand pound* y tolde,
Should not that one be sold. R. C. de Lion, 2325.

44. I had but bare *ten pound* of my father, and *it* would not reach to put me wholly in the fashion.—B. Jons. E. M. out of his Humour, 2. 5.

45. His lands *a hundred yoke* of oxen tilled. Dryd. Æn.

This idiom often has its noun in the plural number.

46. *This three weeks* all my advices, all my letters,
They have been intercepted. B. Jons. The Fox, 2. 3.

47. After Sein Thomas dethe, aboute *an ȝeres to*,
Ther spronk contek, &c. R. Gl. 477.

48. Tis now *a nineteen years* agone at least.
B. Jons. Case is altered, 1. 5.

49. Here's all the hope I've left, *one bare ten shillings*.
B. & Fl. Wit without Money.

50. — they found
Of floreins fine of gold y-coined round,
Wel nigh *an eighte bushels*. Chau. Pard. Tale, 332.

In the cases we have dealt with hitherto, the name of the individual object has been used in a collective sense. Ordinarily collective nouns denote merely the aggregate: *the people, the army, the priesthood,* &c. A large proportion of them were primarily abstract nouns; and in our Old-English poems we find *christente, heathennesse, the paien lay,* &c., treated as collective terms:

51. Haldayn of Doncastre was chosen that ilk day,
To bere the kynges banere ageyn *the paien lay*. R. Br. 17.

Corporate bodies were often referred to under the name of their patron; and the names of places were used much more frequently than at present to denote the inhabitants. When thus used in a collective sense, these nouns are often found united in construction with plural verbs, nouns and pronouns:

52. Lytel had lordes a do. to ȝeve londes fro here aires
To *religion* that *han* no reuþe. þauh hit ryne on *here* auters
In places þer *þei p'sons beþ.* by *hemself* at ese,
Of the poure *han þei* no pyte.
P. Plouhman, pass. 6. Whit. ed.

53. Þer londes and þer rentes were at his wille,
He gaf *S. Cutbert* therof, ȝet *thei hold* it stille. R. Br. 34.

54. —as of late days *our neighbours,*
The upper Germany, can dearly witness. H. VIII. 5. 2.

These nouns are sometimes united in the same sentence, and even in the same clause of a sentence, with verbs and pronouns of different numbers:

55. Alle *the North ende was* in his kepyng,
And *alle þe South ende* to Edward *thei drouh*. R. Br. 32.

56. — O Lord, what shall I say, when *Israel turneth their* backs before their enemies!—Josh. 7.

57. The false revolting Normans thorough thee
Disdain to call us Lord, and *Picardy*
Hath slain their governors. 1 H. VI. 4. 1.

and we often find them construed with a plural verb, while their relative takes a verb singular:

58. But *this people, that knoweth* not the law, *are* cursed.—John 7. 49.

59 The *great supply,*
That was expected by the Dauphin here,
Are wrecked and cast away on Goodwin sands. K. John, 5. 3.

60. — *all that comes* a near him
He thinks *are come* on purpose to destroy him.
Fletcher, Noble Gent. 2.

It is sometimes very difficult to say whether a particular word is used as a collective noun or as the representative of some Anglo-Saxon plural. The old neuter declension left traces behind it which have not, even yet, quite disappeared from our language; *sheep, swine, deer,* still have their nominatives plural the same as their nominatives singular, and *horse* was used as a plural word till the seventeenth century:

61. And all manner of *hors* he knew. Oct. Imp. 1393.

62. Then from the stable their bright *horse* Automedon withdrawes
And Alcymus, put portrils on, and cast upon their jawes
Their bridles, hurling back the raines and hung them on the seate;
The faire scourge then Automedon takes up, and up doth get
To guide the *horse*. Chapman's Iliad.

63. The wife of Anthony
Should have an army for an usher, and
The neighs of *horse* to tell of her approach. Ant. and Cleop. 3. 6.

Hence we should not be justified in classing the following examples with ex. 24, 25, &c.:

64. And for to lead him swithe and smarte
After the bright daies lawe,
There ben ordained for to drawe
Four hors his chare. Gower, Conf. Am.

65. He let him drawe out of the pit,
And his fet set faste i knit
With trais an *two stronge hors*,
And hete to Rome drawe his cors. Seuyn Sages, 1327.

The declension of the Anglo-Saxon *gear* is involved in some uncertainty[*], but we have ventured to consider *year* as a collective noun in ex. 33, 38, 39 : the same collective meaning we have given to the word *breast* in ex. 21; for though *breost* was certainly used in Anglo-Saxon as a plural noun, yet this plural must have been obsolete some centuries before the time of Spenser.

Anglo-Saxon nouns belonging to the *n* declension, as *steorra* a star, *steda* a steed, *assa* an ass, &c., generally formed their plural in *an*, *steorran*, *stedan*, *assan*, &c. But in the Northern dialect they substituted a vowel for the ending *an*; and it is probable that these northern plurals are represented by the *sterre*, *stede*, *asse* of the following examples:

66. The fifte ger he gan argument
Of the *sterre* and of the firmament. Seuyn Sages, 197.

67. When kyng other eorl cam on hym to weorre,
Quyk he lokyd in the *steorre*. K. Alis. 76.

68. As y you sey bothe heore *stede*[†]
Feollen to grounde dede. K. Alis. 2263.

69. And afftyr fyftene hundryd *asse*
Bar wyn and oyle, more and lasse. R. C. de Lion, 6453.

The three works from which we have quoted are strongly marked with the peculiarities of the Northern dialect; but Chaucer's dialect is essentially southern, and we must explain the *lilie* of ex. 14. on some other hypothesis, notwithstanding the Anglo-Saxon *lilie* belongs to the same declension as *steorra*, *steda* and *assa*.

Words which had become familiar as collective terms in some particular construction, readily took the same signification in other idioms. In Anglo-Saxon, a whole class of nouns—the participial nouns ending in *nd*—are peculiarly apt to take a collective meaning[‡]; and it is probably owing to this circumstance that *freond* a friend, and *feond* an enemy have no suffix in their plural, though the vowel is generally found changed in that number—*frynd*, *fynd*. The same remark applies also to the Old-English nouns in *nd*:

---

[*] Grimm makes it neuter, though he probably had no other authority than is afforded by the analogy of the other Gothic dialects and such phrases as *seofon gear*, &c., which abound indeed in Anglo-Saxon, but do not support the inference. English writers generally make it a masculine noun. We cannot readily find any passage which clearly decides the question.

[†] Elsewhere in this romance we have the regular plural in *en*, *steden*, vid. v. 2415.

[‡] See ex. 2.

70. So þat þys tueye breþeren gode *frend* were þo ryȝt.
R. Glou. 388.

Heo nuste wich were here *frend*, ne wych were here fon.
R. Glou. 79. 6.

71. Many were glade þer of & ful sore some
Þat heo schuld of lond wende & neuer eft here *frend* y se.
R. Glou. 95. 15.

72. — hold your hend.
Ye se that I and he are *frend*. Townl. Myst. 48.

And now er thise bot *mansbond*, rascaille of refous. R. Br. 115.

73. Whanne þe kyng wyst þat þei had taken land,
For þo barons he sent þat were his *wele willand.* R. Br. 59.

74. Þat had kept the land þorgh Mald the emperice
Þat were hir *wele willand* were put out of office. R. Br. 112.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. MARCH 14, 1845. No. 31.

Professor WILSON in the Chair.

The following gentlemen were elected members of the Society:

Rev. B. Davies, Ph.D. of Leipsic, President of Stepney College.

Frederick Schönerstedt, Esq., Professor of the German Language at Eton School.

A paper was then read:—

"On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands:"—*Continued.* By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

In a preceding paper an attempt was made to point out some of the characteristics of the Northumbrian dialect of the Saxon, as distinguished from the speech of the southern and western provinces of England. It would have been a matter of great interest and curiosity to trace the various steps of its progress towards the North-British dialects now current; and this would have helped to solve a number of points relative to the formation of the English language, that are now involved in a good deal of obscurity. Unfortunately there is a complete chasm of several centuries in the literary history and monuments of this class of dialects; no considerable specimen being extant exhibiting its state in the eleventh, twelfth, or thirteenth centuries.

In the fourteenth we find abundant remains, and such as entitle it to rank as a leading literary dialect. It may be questioned indeed whether the productions of the northern bards did not exceed those of their brethren in the south in number and merit, prior to the appearance of Gower and Chaucer. Our present business however is with their language, which, when compared with that of the Durham Gospels, will be found to have undergone a considerable change. Of the Saxon declensions of nouns little remains except the genitive singular; the definite or emphatic form of the adjective has totally disappeared; the article (*se, sie, þæt*) appears in the form *the* in all genders; the feminine pronoun of the third person (*hie* or *hyo*) becomes *she* or *scho*; the genitive plural *heara* or *hiara* (*eorum, earum*) is superseded by the possessive *their*; and the first person of the present indicative in *o* or *u*, the most remarkable characteristic of the ancient dialect, is attenuated to *e*. The plurals of verbs in *s*, which in the Durham and Rushworth texts appear along with the more ancient form in *th*, are generally retained, especially in the imperative mood; while the prefix *ge*, which there was already a tendency to omit in Northumbrian Saxon as early as the days of Bede, is scarcely to be met with in the fourteenth century, except in the single participle *ihaten* (called or named). Many words are also found which do not occur in the earlier texts, or in the West-Saxon dialect. Some of these were in all probability current among the Angles, but there are many others which do not appear to have ever been Saxon, in the strict sense of the term. The history of the district would lead us *à priori* to attribute the introduction of them to the Northmen; and we have both external and internal evidence that such a process actually took place. Giraldus Cambrensis and John of Wallingford assert in direct terms that there was a strong infusion of Danish in the population and the language of our northern provinces; and, if confirmation of their testimony were needed, it would be abundantly supplied by the names of landed proprietors preserved in the Domesday Survey, by the present topographical nomenclature of the district, and by a multitude of words, unequivocally of Norse origin. The change of the local name Streoneshalch to Hvitby or Whitby, consequent on the Danish occupation of the district, is well-ascertained, and it is believed that all the names of towns and villages in *by* in the north and east of England are of similar origin. Derby, for example, did not receive its present name till the ninth or tenth century, its original Saxon appellation being Northweorthig.

A remarkable coeval monument, both of the state of the population and of the language, which there are good reasons for attributing to the age of Edward the Confessor, is still extant in Aldburgh church, Holderness, in the East Riding of Yorkshire; it is an inscription commemorating the foundation of the edifice, or more probably of a preceding one, in the following terms:

> Ulf het aræran cyrice for *hanum* and for Gunthara saula*.
>
> Ulf bid erect the church for him and for the soul of Gunthar.

Waving the consideration of those points which more immediately concern the historian and the antiquary, it will be sufficient for us to observe that the name of the founder Ulf is unequivocally Norse, the Anglo-Saxon form being *Wulf*; and that the form of the dative pronoun *hanum* is unknown in all Saxon dialects, being in fact identical with the Old-Norse *hanum*†, Swedish *honom*. A comparison of the Icelandic Landnama Bok or Roll of Proprietors with the Domesday Survey of Yorkshire would furnish many coincidences of names of general occurrence in the Scandinavian provinces, but not known as Anglo-Saxon or German.

It appears that this admixture of the Northmen in the population of the Northumbrian provinces had not produced its full effect upon the language in the tenth century; as, with the exception of one or two isolated words, there is nothing that can be satisfactorily referred to that class of dialects, either in the Durham texts or the Rushworth Gospels. In the fourteenth century the traces of this in-

---

* Archæologia, vol. vi. p. 40. There is some doubt whether the second name should be read Gunthar or Gunwar. Brooke, the author of the paper in the 'Archæologia,' translates "*for hanum*" "*pro Hano,*" as if it were a proper name, contrary to all grammar.

† As extant in Runic inscriptions. The present Icelandic form is *hönum*.

fluence become much stronger. The 'Cursor Mundi' and the Northumbrian metrical version of the Psalms abound with words totally unknown in the Saxon dialects, but of regular occurrence in Icelandic, Danish and Swedish. One of the most remarkable of these is the Scandinavian prefix to infinitives, *at think, at do,* instead of *to think, to do*; which, as Mr. Stevenson justly observes*, is an unequivocal criterion of a purely northern dialect, and an equally certain one of the Scandinavian influence whereby that dialect has been modified. Its retention in the present local speech of Westmoreland† is a sufficient proof of its being truly vernacular. Another remarkable Scandinavianism is the particle *sum* in the sense of *as,* Danish *som*: e.g. "swa sum we forgive oure detturs," so as we forgive our debtors. This form appears to be now obsolete; but *war* for *was,* Dan. *var*; *war,* worse, Dan. *vaerre*; and the apparently ungrammatical inflexions of the present tense singular, *I, thou, he thinks,* perfectly analogous to the Danish *jeg, du, han taenker,* are still regularly current in North Yorkshire. Besides these we find, both in ancient and modern times, *braid* to resemble, Swedish *brås*; "han bråas på sin fader;" in Yorkshire, "he *braids* on his father," *i.e.* takes after or resembles him; *eldin* firing, Dan. *eld* fire; *force* waterfall, Isl. *fors*; *gar* make or cause, Isl. *göra*; *gill* ravine, narrow valley, Isl. *gil*; *greet* weep, Isl. *gráta*; *ket* carrion, Dan. *kiöd* flesh; *lait* seek, Dan. *lede*; *lathe* bárn, Dan. *lade*; *lile* little, Dan. *lille*; with innumerable others, either totally unknown in Anglo-Saxon or found under perfectly distinct forms. It is proper to observe that some of those words and forms are not peculiar to the Northumbrian district, but are also current in the North-Anglian dialect of the West Riding of Yorkshire, where they were equally introduced by the Danes.

It would lead us too far to discuss the distinctive peculiarities of the different subdivisions of the Northumbrian dialect. A form of speech, extending at one time from the Humber to the Forth, and from the German Ocean to the Irish Channel, could hardly be expected to preserve a perfect uniformity under the various influences, both social and political, to which it has been subjected during eight or nine centuries. At present we find the Northumbrian proper, including North and East Yorkshire, the lowland Scottish of the Lothians, the Cumberland and Westmoreland dialects, and the North Lancashire, all to exhibit their respective features of difference; chiefly consisting in minutiæ that it would be difficult to make intelligible in a small compass. A little knowledge of those characteristics would however have proved very serviceable to our editors of ancient poetry and compilers of glossaries, who have created no small confusion by assuming many compositions to be Scottish which were in all probability written between the Humber and the Tyne,

---

* Boucher's Glossary, *v. at.*

† Vide Wheeler's Dialogues, first published in 1794. The first paragraph of the prefatory discourse furnishes the two following examples:—"I hed lile *et* dea," "I had little to do;" "A wark ets fit for nin but parson *et* dea," "A work that's fit for none but a parson to do."

certainly to the south of the Tweed. Thus Jamieson cites as Scotch at least a dozen works which have no real claim to that character; and Sir Walter Scott has grounded a variety of theories respecting the composition of Sir Tristrem on the supposed fact of its having been produced within the Scottish border. The writer has elsewhere* given his reasons at length for believing it to have been a Northumbrian poem, the only existing copy of which was transcribed and considerably altered in a midland county. The 'Proces of the Sevyn Sages' was edited by Weber from the Auchinleck MS. under the gratuitous idea that it afforded the purest and most original text. He speaks disparagingly of the Cotton MS. (Galba, E. 9.), pronouncing it to have been altered by a Scottish transcriber. The truth is, that the Cotton text is not Scottish but pure Northumbrian; and a careful comparison of the two will, it is believed, furnish abundant evidence that the Auchinleck copy is a *rifaccimento* or adaptation of the original Northumbrian text to the dialect of the midland counties, not always very skilfully executed. The same process appears to have been exercised on 'Havelock the Dane,' though more of the northern character has been preserved; and there are also copies of the 'Cursor Mundi' in Midland English, though it can be easily proved it was originally written in Northumbrian. This was in fact the literary dialect of the whole North of England, and no native of that district would have written anything in Southern English which he meant to have currency among his immediate neighbours. A short extract from the 'Cursor Mundi' will place this point in a clear light. Speaking of a legend of "our Levedi and Saint John," the author states:—

> "In a writte this ilke I fand;
> Himself it wroght I understand.
> In suthrin Englys was it drawn,
> And I have turnid it til ur awn
> Langage of the northern lede
> That can non other Englis rede."

The number of the literary monuments of Northumbria, from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, precludes us from giving anything like a general view of them, or attempting to specify the changes which gradually took place in the language. As it may not however be uninteresting to compare its earlier with its declining state, a specimen of each is exhibited for that purpose. The first is taken from the Northumbrian Metrical Psalter, Cotton MSS., Vespasian, D. 7.

TWENTY-THIRD [TWENTY-FOURTH] PSALM.

Of Laverd is land & fulhed his;
Erþeli werld & alle þar in is.
For over sees it grounded he,
And over stremes graiþed it to be.
Wha sal stegh in hille of Laverd winli,
Or wha sal stand in his stede hali?

---

* Warton's History of English Poetry, vol. i. p. 109. ed. 1840.

Underand of hend bidene,
And þat of his hert es clene;
In unnait þat his saule noght nam,
Ne sware to his neghburgh in swikedam.
He sal fang of Laverd blissinge,
And mercy of God his helinge.
Þis is the strend of him sekand,
Þe face of God Jacob laitand.
Oppenes your yates wide,
Ye þat princes ere in pride,
And yhates of ai uphefen be yhe,
And king of blisse income sal he.
Wha es he king of blisse? Laverd strang,
And mightand to fight, Laverd mightand lang.

Oppenes, &c.
Wha es he king of blisse at isse?
Laverd of mightes es king of blisse.

It is worth while to observe how many pure Saxon and Norse terms occur in this short piece, most of them now supplanted by words of Latin origin: viz. *graithed* prepared, *stegh* ascended, *winli* gracious, *underand* innocent, *unnait* vanity, *swikedam* deceitfulness, *fang* receive, *strend* generation, *laitand* inquiring, *uphefen* elevated. Many of these terms have a singular emphasis to those who understand the etymology of them; *underand*, for example, is the precise counterpart of Lat. *innocens*. A careful study of the remains of our language, as written and spoken in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, will indeed show that a vast number of Latin and Romance words have been since introduced without being absolutely needed.

Our next specimen is from the York Mysteries, formerly in the library of Lord Orford and afterwards in the possession of Mr. Bright. This collection is interesting on many accounts, and not the least so as being an undoubted and authentic specimen of the language of the city of York during the latter part of the fourteenth century. At that time the speech of the southern parts of the island had begun to make considerable inroads upon that of the more cultivated classes in the north, and a great portion of the Mysteries is almost as much metropolitan as Northumbrian. Fortunately an older copy of the play describing the creation of our first parents, has been preserved along with the more recent revision. Though this, as compared with the 'Cursor Mundi' or the Psalter, is much softened down, it still retains strong traces of its original Northumbrian character. The various readings are from the more recent copy.

YORK MYSTERIES.

CARDMAKER'S PLAY.

Deus. In hevyn and erthe duly bedene,
Of v. days werke evyn on to ende,
I have complete by curssis clene;
Me thynke y^{e} space of yame well spende.

In hevyn er angels fayre and brighte,
Sternes and planetis yar curssis to ga[1].
Ye mone servis on to y^e nyght,
The son to lyghte y^e day alswa[2].

In erthe is treys and gres to springe;
Bestis and foulys bothe gret and smalle;
Fysschis in flode; alle othyr thyng
Thryffe and have my blyssyng alle.

This werke is wroght now at my wille;
But ʒet can I no best see
Yat acordys be kynde and skyll,
And for my werke myght worschippe me.

For perfytte werke ne ware it nane[3],
But ought ware made y^t myght it ʒeme.
For love mad I yis warlde[4] alane[5]:
Therfor my loffe sall[6] in it seme.

To kepe this warlde[4] bothe mare[7] and lesse,
A skylfulle best yane wille I make
Eftyr my schape and my lyknes,
The wilke salle[6] worschippe to my [me] take.

Off y^e symplest part of erthe y^t is here
I sall[6] make man, and for yis skylle,
For to abate his hauttande chere,
Bothe his gret pride and other ille.

And also for to have in mynde
How simpylle he is at hys makyng.
For als febylle I sall[6] fynde hym
Qwen he is dede at his endynge.

For yis reson and skylle alane[8],
I sall[6] make man lyke on to me.
Ryse up y^u erthe in blode and bane[9],
In schape of man I commaunde the.

A female sall[10] y^u have to fere;
Her sall[6] I make of y^i lyft[11] rybe:
Alane[8] so sall[6] y^u nought be here
Withoutyn faythefull frende and sybe.

Takys now here y^e gast[12] of lyffe
And ressayve bothe youre saules[13] of me.
The femalle take y^u to y^i wyffe;
Adam and Eve your names salle[6] be.

---

[1] B. goo. [2] also. [3] none. [4] worlde. [5] alone. [6] shalle. [7] more. [8] allone. [9] bone. [10] shalte. [11] lefte. [12] goste. [13] soules.

Adam. A lorde! full mekyll is y^{i} mighte;
And yat is sene in ilke a syde.
For now his here a joyfull syght,
To se yis worlde so lange[14] and wyde.

Mony[15] divers thyngis now here es
Off bestis and foulis bothe wylde and tame:
ȝet is nan made to y^{e} [y^{i}] liknes,
But we alone; a lovyd by y^{i} name!

Eve. To swylke a lorde in all y^{e} degre
Be evirmore lastande lovynge,
Yat tyll[16] us swylke[17] a dyngnite
Has gyffyne before alle othyr thynge.

And selcouth thyngis may we se here
Of yis ilke warlde, so lange[14] and brade[18],
With bestis and fowlis so many and sere:
Blessid be he y^{t} [hase] us made!

Adam. A blyssid lorde! now at y^{i} wille
Syne[19] we er wroght, woche saff to telle,
And also say us two un tylle
Qwate[20] we sall[6] do and whare[21] to dwelle.

Deus. For yis skyl made I ȝow yis day
My name to worschip ay whare[21].
Lovys me for y^{i} and lovys me ay
For my makyng,—I axke no mare[22].

Bothe wys and witty sall[6] y^{u} be,
Als man y^{t} I have made of noght.
Lordschippe in erthe yan graunt I the;
Alle thynge to serve the y^{t} I have wroghte.

In paradyse salle[6] ȝe same wone:
Of erthely thyng get ȝe no nede:
Ille and gude[23] both salle[6] ȝe kone:
I salle[6] ȝou lerne ȝoure lyve to lede.

Adam. A lorde! sene we salle[6] do no thyng,
But louffe y^{e} for y^{i} gret gudnesse[24],
We sall[6] ay bay to y^{i} byddyng,
And fulfill it both more and less.

Eve. His syng sone he has on us sette
Beforne alle othre thyng certayne.
Hem for to love we sall[6] noght lett,
And worschip hym with myght and mayne.

Deus. At hevyne and erth first I begane,
And vi days wroghte or I walde[25] ryst.
My warke is endyde now at mane;
Alle lykes me welle, but yis is beste.

[14] longe. [15] many. [16] to. [17] suche. [18] broode. [19] sethen. [20] whatte.
[21] where. [22] more. [23] goode. [24] goodnesse. [25] wolde.

My blyssyng have yai ever and ay!
The seveynte day sall[6] my restyng be:
Yus wille I sese, sothely to say,
Of my doyng in y^{is} degre.

To blys I salle[6] ȝow bryng:
Comys forth ȝe tow with me!
Ȝe salle[6] lyffe in lykyng;
My blyssyng wyth ȝow be.—Amen.

Here, besides a gradual approximation of the orthography to the southern standard, it will be observed that the forms *nane, alane, warlde, lange, brade,* &c. become in the later copy *none, alone, world, long, broad*; and that the Northumbrianisms *swa, gude, sall, swilke, til,* have respectively become *so, good, shall, such, to*. The present participle in *and*, a certain criterion of a northern dialect subsequent to the thirteenth century, and the imperative plural in *s*, with a few other peculiarities, are preserved in both copies.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Vol. II. APRIL 11, 1845. No. 32.

Professor Wilson, Vice-President, in the Chair.

A paper was read—

"On the Meaning of the Word σάρος." By Professor Latham.

The words σάρος and *sarus* are the Greek and Latin forms of a certain term used in the oldest Babylonian chronology, the meaning of which is hitherto undetermined. In the opinion of the present writer, the *sarus* is a period of 4 years and 340 days.

In the way of direct external evidence as to the value of the epoch in question, we have, with the exception of an unsatisfactory passage in Suidas, at the hands of the ancient historians, and according to the current interpretations, only the two following statements:—

1. That each *sarus* consisted of 3600 years (ἔτη).
2. That the first ten kings of Babylon reigned 120 *sari*, equal to 432,000 years; or on an average 43,200 years apiece.

With *data* of this sort, we must either abandon the chronology altogether, or else change the power of the word *year*. The first of these alternatives was adopted by Cicero and Pliny, and doubtless other of the ancients—*contemnamus etiam Babylonios et eos qui e Caucaso cœli signa observantes numeris et motubus stellarum cursus persequuntur; condemnemus inquam hos aut stultitiæ aut vanitatis aut impudentiæ qui* CCCCLXX *millia annorum, ut ipsi dicunt, monumentis comprehensa continent.*—*Cic. de Divinat.*, from Cory's *Ancient Fragments*. Again—*e diverso Epigenes apud Babylonios* DCCXX *annorum observationes siderum coctilibus laterculis inscriptas docet, gravis auctor in primis: qui minimum Berosus et Critodemus* CCCCLXXX *annorum.*—Pliny, vii. 56, from Cory. On the other hand, to alter the value of the word ἔτος or *annus* has been the resource of at least one modern philologist.

Now if we treat the question by what may be called the *tentative* method, the first step in our inquiry will be to find some division of time which shall, at once, be *natural* in itself, and also short enough to make 10 *sari* possible parts of an average human life. For this, even a *day* will be too long. *Twelve hours*, however, or half a νυχθήμερον, will give us possible results.

Taking this view therefore, and leaving out of the account the 29th of February, the words ἔτος and *annus* mean, not a year, but the 730th part of one; 3600 of which make a *sarus*. In other words, a *sarus* = 1800 day-times and 1800 night-times, or 3600 νυχθήμερα, or 4 years + 340 days.

The texts to which the present hypothesis applies are certain passages in Eusebius and Syncellus. These are founded upon the writings of Alexander Polyhistor, Apollodorus, Berosus, and Abydenus. From hence we learn the length of the ten reigns alluded to above, viz. 120 *sari*, or 591 years and odd days. *Reigns* of this period are just possible. It is suggested, however, that the *reign* and *life* are dealt with as synonymous; or at any rate, that some period beyond that during which each king sat singly on his throne has been recorded.

The method in question led the late Professor Rask to a different power for the word *sarus*. In his *Ældste Hebraiske Tidregnung* he writes as follows: "The meaning of the so-called *sari* has been impossible for me to discover. The ancients explain it differently. Dr. Ludw. Ideler, in his *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, i. 207, considers it to mean some lunar period; without however defining it, and without sufficient closeness to enable us to reduce the 120 *sari*, attributed to the ten ancient kings, to any probable number of real years. I should almost believe that the *sarus* was a year of 24 months, so that the 120 *sari* meant 240 natural years." *p.* 32. Now Rask's hypothesis has the advantage of leaving the meaning of the word *reign* as we find it. On the other hand, it blinks the question of *ἔτη* or *anni* as the parts of a *sarus*. Each doctrine, however, is equally hypothetical; the value of the *sarus*, in the present state of our inquiry, resting solely upon the circumstance of its giving a plausible result from plausible assumptions. The *data* though which the present writer asserts for his explanation the proper amount of probability are contained in two passages hitherto unapplied.

1. From Eusebius—*is* (Berosus) sarum *ex annis* 3600 *conflat. Addit etiam nescio quem* nerum *ac* sosum: nerum *ait* 600 *annis constare*, sosum *annis* 60. *Sic ille de veterum more annos computat.*—Translation of the Armenian Eusebius, p. 5, from *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, p. 439: Paris, 1841.

2. Berosus—*σάρος δὲ ἐστιν ἑξακόσια καὶ τρισχίλια ἔτη, νῆρος δὲ ἑξακόσια, σώσσος δὲ ἑξήκοντα.*—From Cory's *Ancient Fragments*.

Now the assumed value of the word translated *year* (viz. 12 hours), in its application to the passages just quoted, gives for the powers of the three terms three divisions of time as natural as could be expected under the circumstances.

1. *Σώσσος.*—The *sosus* = 30 days and 30 nights, or 12 hours × 60, or a month of 30 days, *μὴν τριακονθήμερος.* Aristotle writes—*ἡ μὴν Λακωνικὴ ἕκτον μέρος τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, τοῦτο δὲ ἐστιν ἡμέραι ἑξήκοντα.*—From Scaliger, *De Emendatione Temporum*, p. 23. Other evidence occurs in the same page.

2. Ν*ῆρος.*—The *nerus* = 10 *sosi* or months = the old Roman year of that duration.

3. *Σάρος.*—The *sarus* = 6 *neri* or 60 months of 30 days each; that is, five proper years within 25 days. This would be a cycle or *annus magnus*.

All these divisions are probable. Against that of 12 hours no objection lies except its inconvenient shortness. The month of 30 days is pre-eminently natural. The year of 10 months was common in early times. In favour of the *sarus* of five years (or nearly so) there are two facts:—

1. It is the multiple of the *sosus* by 10, and of the *nerus* by 6.
2. It represents the period when the natural year of 12 months coincides for the first time with the artificial one of 10; since 60 months = 6 years of 10 months and 5 of 12.

The historical application of these numbers is considered to lie beyond the pale of the present inquiry.

In Suidas we meet an application of the principle recognised by Rask, viz. the assumption of some period of which the *sarus* is a fraction. Such at least is the probable view of the following interpretation: ΣΑ'ΡΟΙ—*μέτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸς παρὰ Χαλδαίοις, οἱ γὰρ ρκ' σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐνιαυτοὺς βσκβ', οἱ γίγνονται ιη' ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἕξ.*—From Cory's *Ancient Fragments**.

In Josephus we find the recognition of an *annus magnus* containing as many *ἔτη*. as the *nerus* did: *ἔπειτα καὶ δι' ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν εὐχρηστίαν, ὧν ἐπενόουν ἀστρολόγιας καὶ γεωμέτριας πλέον ζῆν τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῖς παρασχεῖν· ἅπερ οὐκ ἦν ἀσφαλῶς αὐτοῖς προειπεῖν μὴ ζήσασιν ἑξακοσίους ἐνιαυτούς· διὰ τοσοῦτον γὰρ ὁ μέγας ἐνιαυτὸς πληροῦται.*—*Antiq.* i. 3. from Cory.

The following doctrine is a suggestion, viz. that in the word *sosus* we have the Hebrew שֵׁשׁ = *six*. If this be true, it is probable that the *sosus* itself was only a secondary division, or some other period multiplied by six. Such would be a period of five days, or ten *ἔτη* (so-called). With this view we get two probabilities, viz. a subdivision of the month, and the alternation of the numbers 6 and 10 throughout; *i. e.* from the *ἔτος*† (or 12 hours) to the *sarus* (or five years).

After the reading of this paper, a long discussion followed on the question, how far the *sarus* could be considered as belonging to historical chronology. The Chairman thought there could be no doubt that the same principles which regulated the mythological periods of the Hindoos prevailed also in the Babylonian computations, although there might be some variety in their application.

1. A *mahayuga* or great age of the Hindoos, comprising the four successive *yugas* or ages, consists of 4,320,000 years.

---

* This gloss in some MSS. is filled up thus:—

Σάροι. μέτρον καὶ ἀριθμὸς παρὰ Χαλδαίοις. οἱ γὰρ ρκ' σάροι ποιοῦσιν ἐνιαυτοὺς βσκβ', κατὰ τὴν τῶν Χαλδαίων ψῆφον, εἴπερ ὁ σάρος ποιεῖ μῆνας σεληνιακῶν σκβ', οἳ γίνονται ιη' ἐνιαυτοὶ καὶ μῆνες ἕξ.

† In the course of the evening it was stated, that even by writers quoted by Syncellus *ἔτος* had been translated *day*; and a reference was made to an article in the Cambridge Philological Museum *On the Days of the Week*, for the opinion of Bailly in modern, and of Annianus and Panodorus in ancient times: *ταῦτα ἔτη ἡμέρας ἐλογίσαντο στοχαστικῶς.*—p. 40, vol. i. See also p. 42.

2. These years being divided by 360, the number of days in the Indian lunar year, give 12,000 periods.

3. By casting off two additional cyphers, these numbers are reduced respectively to 432,000 and 120, the numbers of the years of the *saroi* of the ten Babylonian kings, whilst in the numbers 12,360 and 3600 we have the coincidence of other elements of the computation.

The Annual General Meeting of the Society for the election of Council and Officers for the ensuing year will be held at the London Library, 49 Pall Mall, on Friday, the 23rd of May. The Chair will be taken at Eight o'clock.

Papers will be read (if time permit) as at ordinary meetings.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. APRIL 25, 1845. No. 33.

T. H. KEY, Esq. in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table:—

"Tanchumi: Commentarius in Lamentationes;" presented by the Rev. W. Cureton.

Three Tracts, by Charles T. Beke, Esq., Ph.D., F.S.A.:—1. "Abyssinia; being a continuation of Routes in that Country," with a map.—2. "On the Countries south of Abyssinia," with a map.—3. "On Christianity among the Gallas;" presented by Dr. Beke.

The following paper was then read:—

"On the Languages and Dialects of Abyssinia and the Countries to the South," by Dr. Beke.

The accompanying vocabularies were collected during a residence in Abyssinia, in the years 1841, 1842, and 1843. They consist of the following languages: 1. Hhámạra, or Agau of Wáag; 2. Falásha; 3. Agáwi, or Agau of Agaumíder; 4. Gafat; 5. Gonga; 6. Kaffa; 7. Worạ́tta; 8. Wolámo, or Woláitsa; 9. Yángaro; 10. Shánkạla of Agaumíder; 11. Galla of Gúderu; 12. Tigre; 13. Hạ́rrargie (Hurrur).

For the representation of the sounds of these languages, the following system of orthography has been adopted. The vowels generally, whether single or diphthongal, are sounded as they are in Italian*. In addition to these, *ạ* is used to represent the short indistinct *first* vowel-sound of the Ethiopic and Arabic alphabets, nearly like the English short *u* in *but*; whilst *é* corresponds in sound with the French *é* in *téte*. The consonants are (subject to the following remarks) to be pronounced as they usually are in English. They are however not intended to represent the precise native sounds, to which they are in many cases only approximations; near enough, however, for all practical purposes.

Of the consonants and their combinations, *ch* is pronounced as in *church*—never hard as in the German. *Dh* is a sound peculiar to the Galla language and extremely difficult to be acquired, the *d* being followed by a sort of *hiatus*, or guttural approaching to the Arabic ع. *Dj* is as the *dge* in *judge*; *j* as the French *j* in *jour*. *G* is always hard, as in *give*, *gu* and *gh* never being employed to render this consonant hard before *e* or *i*. *Gh* is the Arabic غ. *H*, *hh*, and *kh* are used as is customary in representing the sounds of the Arabic and other Oriental languages: *ñ*, and sometimes *ny*, are sounded as the Spanish *ñ*. In the Agau languages *ng* is sounded as in *ring*, *ringer* (not as in *finger*), and this not only at the end and in the middle of a word, but likewise at the beginning; but in the

---

* The accented *o* has mostly a sound approaching to that of *uo* in *buono*.

other languages the two letters are pronounced as in *finger*: e. g. *Gonga*. *Qu* is not made use of by me, but *kw* is employed in its stead. *S* is always hard, the soft sound of this letter being invariably represented by *z*. *Ts* is the German *tz*, although scarcely so distinct as this; and in some dialects it is little more than a hard *t* or *th*, struck forcibly against the upper teeth. It must be understood that *th* is never to be pronounced as in English. *W* has its English sound. In Ludolf's Amharic Grammar a character is found which is stated by him to have been invented by the scribes of Abyssinia to represent the liquid sound of *m*—*m̃* (*my̆* or *mj*); the use of which character, however, he is at a loss to account for. I find this liquid *m* to be a sound peculiar to the *Galla* language, e. g. *m̃e* (*my̆e*) "pray"; "I beg you"—the character for which may have been invented in Abyssinia at the same time that the well-known Amharic additions to the Geez alphabet were made; although, unlike these, it has fallen into desuetude and oblivion.

Of the languages in my lists, the first three are the Hhámạra, the Falásha, and the Agáwi, which will at once be seen to be cognate and intimately connected with one another. The Hhámạra is spoken among the Agaus of Wáag, the northern portion of Lásta—the Tcheratz Agows of Bruce. The Falásha is the language of the remarkable people scattered over parts of northern and western Abyssinia, who still profess the Israelitish religion. The Agáwi is that of the Agaus of Agaumider, which native tradition says was formerly spoken over the greater part of the peninsula of Gódjam. Of these three languages, vocabularies are given by Professor Murray in his 'Life of Bruce,' Edinburgh, 1808, pp. 436–439, the same having been written down for that traveller by Abyssinian scribes in the Geez character. Professor Murray remarks (p. 436), that "probably the native sounds are not very accurately conveyed by the Habbessine alphabet; but of this no opinion can be given with certainty by any person who has never heard them uttered." As my vocabularies were each of them written down by myself from the mouths of natives, I am able to bear testimony to the justness of this remark. At the same time I am bound to bear the like testimony to the general correctness of Bruce's vocabularies, which for the purpose of comparison I have added to my own, the same being enclosed within brackets. In one remarkable particular, however, Bruce's scribes were unavoidably unable to represent the true sound of these Agau languages, which abound in the harsh *gh* (غ); for, as this sound is wanting in the Geez and Amharic, it had either to be omitted by them altogether, or else to be imperfectly represented by an aspirate. This imperfection in the written character of his scribes led Bruce into a curious etymological error. He says that the appellation of the Agaus generally is *Ag-oha*, which he translates "Shepherds of the River[*]." Now, *Aghaghá* (*gh* = غ) is the native name of the Agaus of Agaumider, which in the mouths of the Abyssinians generally has been softened down into አገው, *Ágạu*,

[*] Vol. i. p. 401, edit. pr.

but which Bruce's scribes, in their anxiety to give it the true sound as nearly as possible, made "Agohá[*]"; and as that traveller always writes "oha" or "ohha" for the Amharic ውኃ, *wĕha* or *wạ́ha*, the signification of which is "water," we have at once a clue to the origin of his mistake[†].

Upon Bruce's assertion, that the dialects of the Agaus have an affinity to that of the Faláshas, Dr. Prichard remarks[‡], that "the comparisons of these languages which have as yet been made, leave this assertion subject to some doubt." I apprehend that the present vocabularies will, beyond all question, decide this point in the affirmative.

Who the people are that speak this common Agau tongue in its various forms is an ethnological question of much interest. I have already expressed the opinion[§] that the Agau nation are the representatives of the original inhabitants of Abyssinia, who have in part been dispossessed by the Amharas breaking through them from the south. The Hhámạra of Wáag and the Aghaghá of Agaumider have maintained their nationality in their not easily accessible countries, whilst the Faláshas and other *low-castes* scattered over the provinces lying between the other two, are the remains of the ancient inhabitants of Agau race, the physical character of whose country has not afforded them the same means of resistance. To this should be added, that towards the north, namely in Tigre, they had, at an earlier date than that of the irruption of the Amharas from the south, been in like manner displaced by the Axumites or Agazi (the Geez-speaking race), whose language plainly shows them to have crossed from the opposite shores of the Red Sea since the time of the occupation of Arabia by the progenitors of its actual inhabitants. The tradition among the Agaus is, that they themselves, at a yet more remote period, crossed the Red Sea into Africa[||], the western tribes of Agaumider subsequently branching off from those in Lásta, and dispossessing the Shánkạlas, who then inhabited Agaumider, but who have

---

[*] I perceive that M. d'Abbadie writes the name "Awawa," evidently from his having, like Bruce, received it through an *Abyssinian* ear and mouth.

[†] In a pamphlet recently published by me, *A Statement of Facts relative to the Transactions between the Writer and the late British Political Mission to the Court of Shoa*, p. 13, *note*, it is remarked, that "the country of the Hhámạra, or eastern Agaus, through which I passed on my way home, is composed in many parts of a loose sandstone, in caves hollowed in which the inhabitants frequently form their dwellings. These are apparently the Troglodytes of Agatharchides, and their language—and not the Amharic—is doubtless the Καμαρα or Καμαρας λεξις of that writer. *Periplus Rubri Maris*, p. 46. It is they too, and not the Hamyarites *of Arabia*, who are the 'Hamara' named in the Ethiopic inscription of Axum. See Rüppell's *Reise in Abyssinien*, vol. ii. p. 280; and see the Greek inscription in Lord Valentia's *Travels*, vol. iii. p. 181, and Salt's *Voyage to Abyssinia*, p. 411."

[‡] *The Physical History of Mankind*, second edit. vol. ii. p. 146.

[§] *Statement of Facts*, &c. p. 13, *note*.

[||] Whether or not any connexion exists between the Agau languages of Abyssinia and the ancient Himyari tongue, of which the remains have recently been discovered in the Mahrah of Southern Arabia (see *Journal of the Roy. Geogr. Soc.* vol. xv. p. 112), is a question deserving of investigation. See my *Origines Biblicæ*, vol. i. pp. 163 and 228.

since been forced to confine themselves to the valley of the Blue River. It is to be observed that in a country like Abyssinia, consisting of a high table-land, with the rivers running in mountainous valleys at a depression of several thousand feet, the low lands are the fastnesses of the aborigines, in the same way as, under similar circumstances, the *high*lands are in Europe.

In speaking of the "*low*-castes" of Abyssinia, I allude to the Kamánts—by Bruce written *Kimmont*, whom he mentions to have found on his return from Gondar, and describes as a detached tribe of the Faláshas, who had been converted to Christianity, but retained the customs and language of their kindred,—and other tribes dispersed, like the Faláshas themselves, over various parts of the country, all of whom live apart from the Amharas, and employ themselves in various *servile* trades, which the high-caste dominant race do not condescend to adopt. They are manifestly the remains of a *conquered* and degraded people. The *native* languages of Démbea, Kwára, and generally the north-west of Abyssinia, are all modifications of one primitive Agau tongue, and plainly prove the various people speaking them to have all sprung from one common parent stock, of which, from their peculiar habits, the Faláshas are the most remarkable branch.

The next language to be considered is the Gáfat, which in the present day appears to be spoken in only a small portion of the south of Damot, now occupied by the descendants of the Djáwi Gallas, who have entered that country from beyond the Abai. In consequence of the encroachments of the Gallas on the one hand, and of the dominant race, the Amharas, on the other, the Gáfat language is on the eve of extinction. So little indeed is the knowledge of it prevalent, that the rising generation seem almost ignorant of it, and even the grown-up persons who do profess to speak it are anything but familiar with it; for I found that they frequently required consideration before answering my inquiries as to the names of the simplest objects. From my list of words it will be perceived that the far greater number are Amharic, either quite pure or at most but slightly modified. On the other hand, those words which really do vary from the Amharic appear to have not the slightest connexion with either that language or with the Agáwi formerly spoken throughout the greater part of the peninsula, or with the Galla or Gonga tongues. Ludolf supposes the language of Gáfat to be a very remote dialect of the Amharic. I am rather inclined to consider it as an independent language*, and to regard the Amharic words found in it as not forming part of the original tongue, but as having been introduced by the amalgamation of the two people. Dr. Murray has given from Bruce a list of Gáfat words, which are inserted (within brackets) in my tables. It is important to remark, that the words collected by Bruce seventy years ago have a far more independent character than those brought home by me. This is quite in accordance with my conclusion as to the gradual but general merging of this language in the Amharic.

* Is it cognate with the Geez ?

In my converse with the natives of Gáfat, I noticed three peculiarities of their language, according as the same was communicated to me by different persons and in different places. Some gave to almost every word the termination *ish*; others the termination *oa*; whilst again others gave neither of these, nor in fact any prevailing termination. The *oa* appears to be adopted from the neighbouring Agaus, in whose language that termination is common; and it may be that the dropping of a prevalent termination has been borrowed from the Amharic, since I was assured by many persons that the ending in *ish* is a peculiarity of the Gáfat tongue.

The most interesting class of languages is composed of those contained in the next five lists; namely the Gónga, Káffa, Worātta, Woláitsa, and Yángaro,—interesting, because this class of languages is, I believe, now for the first time submitted to the investigation of the learned world. Ludolf describes the Gongas as composing a distinct nation of Abyssinia, dwelling to the south of the river Abai, and speaking a language unconnected with all those common throughout Abyssinia to the north of about the tenth parallel of north latitude, but the same with that spoken by the people of Enárea. This statement, however correct as regards former times, requires to be modified in the present day. For, by the irruption of the Gallas and their occupation of the table-land between the rivers Abai and Gódjeb, the Gonga race has been cut through, and, where not extirpated, divided into two parts, who have respectively been driven into the valleys of those two rivers. Enárea in particular—formerly, like Abyssinia, a Christian country,—was for a time able to hold out against the invaders, but in the end it fell a prey to the Limmu tribe of Gallas (then pagans, but of late years converted to Mohammedanism), who still continue to possess it. The consequence is, that as well in Enárea as throughout the whole table-land northward as far as the valley of the Abai, the Galla language has superseded that of the earlier Gongas. But further to the south and south-west, in regions stretching wide into the interior of Africa, languages cognate with the Gonga are still spoken. Of those of Káffa, Worātta, Woláitsa and Yángaro, specimens are here given; but I was told of the countries of Derbábbo, Mócha and Afíllo, beyond Káffa, to the west, where cognate languages prevail, and where likewise Christianity, though in a wretchedly degraded form, still continues to be professed. The existence of the Christian religion in the interior of Africa, where it was planted probably in the earliest ages of our era, is a remarkable fact, deserving of far more attention than it has hitherto received. It is, however, daily wearing out; on the one hand passing by almost imperceptible degrees into mere polytheism*, and on the other being supplanted by Mohammedanism, which would seem destined to become ere long the faith of the whole of this portion of the African continent. The Gonga language, as spoken in the western portion of the valley of the Abai, is the only existing representative of a once-powerful

---

* See the paper "On Christianity among the Gallas," mentioned at the head of this article.

kingdom situate in the fork between the two branches of the Blue River; the one (the Dedhésa) coming from Enárea, and the other (the Abai) encircling Godjam. This valley district (which I visited in December 1842) is called in the native dialect Sínicho, in Agáwi Tsíntsi, but in Amharic and Gáfat, Shínasha—the Chinchon of the Portuguese; and its natives retain the tradition of the former existence of their country as a separate and mighty state, and still apply the name of Gonga to a considerable tract of country on the southern side of the Abai.

The affinity of the languages of Káffa*, Worátta, and Woláitsa to that of Gonga is manifest. That of the language of Yángaro (by the Gallas called Djándjero—the Gingiro of the maps) is not so evident, but still may be traced.

In a letter from M. Antoine d'Abbadie to the Rev. G. C. Renouard, published in the Athenæum of the 12th April 1845, he speaks of his having collected "vocabularies of the three principal Chamitic languages of Great Damot; namely Sidama, 1700 words; Dawrooa, 1500 words; and Yămma or Yangara, 1400 words." The two former languages are the *Kaffa* and *Worátta* of my lists under other names. Yămma or Yangara is, of course, my *Yángaro*. My *Woláitsa*, of which the *Galla* name is Wolámo, is called by M. d'Abbadie "Walamo or Wălăhayta." I do not perceive from M. d'Abbadie's letter any intimation of his having become acquainted with any other distinct and separate *language* of this portion of the interior of Africa, the numerous names enumerated by him being apparently only those of *dialects*. But his collections, made during a lengthened stay in Eastern Africa, are so copious as to promise a rich treat to philologists.

M. d'Abbadie classes the Agau and Gonga languages together in one family, which he names the "Chamitic." To this classification and denomination I cannot object, inasmuch as they are only in accordance with my own views with respect to the *Hamitish* origin of *all* the languages of Arabia and Africa†. But it will be understood that I do not agree with him in the narrow sense in which he uses the term "Chamitic," as *opposed to* "Semitic." Neither can I perceive any such affinity between the Gonga and Agau languages in their respective forms, as to warrant the placing of them together in *one* group, as contradistinguished from any other group of Abyssinian languages.

The next language in my lists is that of the Shánkalas or *negroes* of Agaumider and the valley of the Blue River, in about the eleventh parallel of north latitude. Dr. Murray mentions that Bruce could not

---

* Under the head of *Kaffa* I have added (within brackets) a few words collected in Shoa by the Rev. Mr. Krapf, apparently from the mouth of a slave named Dilbo, personally known to us both. They do not altogether agree with *my* Kaffa words, which I obtained from persons who were most assuredly natives of Bónga, the capital of that country. From Dilbo's physical appearance and other circumstances, I have reason to believe that he was a native, not of Kaffa itself, but of some neighbouring country, which will account for the difference of language.

† See *Origines Biblicæ*, chap. x.

procure any specimen of their language. That collected by myself is, unfortunately, not very extensive. The travellers (Caillaud, Russegger, &c.) who have ascended the Blue River ought to have reached districts inhabited by negro tribes speaking dialects of the same tongue.

To the north of these Shánkạlas, in about the twelfth parallel, are the Gíndjar (*Ganjar* of Bruce) inhabiting the sandy district emphatically styled *Abu Rámla*. Bruce reports* that "the origin of these is said to have been, that when the Funge, or black nation now occupying Sennaar, dispossessed the Arabs from that part of the country, the black slaves that were in service among these Arabs all fled, and took possession of the districts they now hold, where they have greatly increased in numbers, and continue independent to this day." This tradition is quite in accordance with the fact that the language of Gíndjar is little more than a corrupt Arabic, as I had the means of ascertaining when in Agaumider in March 1842, and as the following short list of words will sufficiently show:—

day	nahár.	*head*	ras.
night	líel.	*neck*	rạ́ggaba.
morning	sóbahh.	*mouth*	shamạ́k.
evening	ạshir.	*nose*	náhhera.
earth	wóta.	*eye*	éin.
water	álma.	*ear*	adán.
grass	gesh.	*hair*	shar.
mountain	gạ́llah.	*house*	bíet.
river	ḥor.	*meat*	láhhem.
man	rádjil.	*bread*	kíssera.
woman	mạ́rra.	*good*	sạ́mmi.
boy	djénna.	*bad*	fạ́ssil.
girl	bint.	*black*	áswad.
father	ábu.	*white*	ábiạd.
mother	um.	*red*	áḥmar.
brother	ákhu.	*come*	táal.
sister	okht.	*go*	ráuih.
hand	id.	*sit down*	águd.
arm	deráh.	*rise*	ágif ; gūm.
leg	kuráh.	*bring*	djíbu.
foot	kafat kurái.	*give him*	ạudíhu.

The Galla, which stands the next in my vocabularies, is the dialect of that widely-spoken language employed generally among the *western* tribes who occupy the countries from Enárea to Gúderu, and who have penetrated across the Abai into the peninsula of Gódjam. It varies in some respects from the dialect of the Gallas of Shoa. From a comparison with the Galla words within brackets which I have taken from Bruce, it will be seen that in his time the inhabitants of Maitsha (Miécha) to the south of Lake Tsána spoke identically the same language.

I feel myself here called on to remark on the title "Ilmorma,"

---

* Vol. iv. p. 328.

which M. d'Abbadie gives to the language so universally known both in Abyssinia and in Europe under the name of *Galla*. Independently of the objection which may reasonably be made to the introduction of a *new* name, when there already exists one which has a specific and well-defined application and which has met with general adoption, the word "Ilmorma," as a designation of the Galla *language*, is in itself incorrect. *Ilm 'orma* is composed of two Galla words—*ilma*, "son," and *orma*, "man": in the Rev. Mr. Krapf's translation of the Gospel, "the Son of man" is rendered *Ilma Orma*. The Gallas, with the usual pride of wild and independent nations, call themselves exclusively *Orma*, i. e. "men," "the people"; and an individual among them is *Ilm 'orma*, "a son (or one) of the people," corresponding literally with the Arabic *ibn-el-nas*—"gentilis," "well-born," "*free*"—as opposed to the *àbd* or *slave*. The native designation of the Dankáli tribes—*Affar*—has (if I mistake not) precisely the same meaning. In the same way, therefore, as the free Galla styles himself *Ilm 'orma*, he calls his language *Afan Orma*, "the *people's* tongue"—*lit.* "mouth." Consequently, if it were worth while to introduce a new name, we ought to call the Galla the *Orma* language—certainly not the "*Ilmorma**."

My vocabularies conclude with the Tigre language, and a few words of that of Hárrargie (Hurrur). This latter, like that of Argóbba (the eastern skirt of Ifat) and Gurágie, is little more than a dialect of the Amharic (Geez?), mixed with much Dankáli and likewise Arabic. Some words of this language are added (within brackets) from a manuscript collection of the late Lieutenant Kielmaier, kindly communicated to me, in the original, by Professor Widenmann of Munich.

---

* Since this was written, I have seen, in the *Friend of the African* for March last, p. 152, an extract from Mr. Krapf's journal, in which he proposes the name *Ormania* for "the Galla nation and its territory, because they call themselves *Orma*, and not Gallas." If this designation were adopted, the language would have to be named the Ormanian, or, better, the *Orman*.

Shánkala of Agaumider.	Galla of Gúderu.	Tigre.	Hạ́rrargie.	
mítal	táka; tóko	hhádie	hhad [ahad]	*one.*
ámband	láma	khelíttie	kōt [kad]	*two.*
úkag	sádi	seléstie	shíshti [shishet]	*three.*
ạnzácha	áfur	arbátie	árat [hárat]	*four.*
mákus	shan	hamíshtie	ámist [hámmist]	*five.*
tángali	djáha	shidíshtie	sídist [sédisti]	*six.*
lạngítta	tórba	shuháttie	sáat [sáati]	*seven.*
....	sádiet	shomúntie	sūt [sud]	*eight.*
....	sággạl	tishạántie	zeteiñ [sạting]	*nine.*
mánkus	kúdhạn	asạ́rtie	ássir [asser]	*ten.*
....	kúdha tóko	asạ́rtie hhádie	assirahhád [asser-ahad]	*eleven.*
....	kúdha láma	....	assirakot	*twelve.*
....	digdáma	ásera	kwía [kuia]	*twenty.*
....	digdámi tóko	ásera hhádie	....	*twenty-one.*
....	digdámi láma	....	....	*twenty-two.*
....	sodóma	selạ́ssa	sása [sasa]	*thirty.*
....	afúrtama	arbaá	arbạéin [arbaîn]	*forty.*
....	shántama	hámsa	hémsa [hamist-essr]	*fifty.*
....	djahátama	síssa	síssa [sedistessr]	*sixty.*
....	torbátama	sebaá	sebatássir [sâ't-essr]	*seventy.*
....	sadiétama	semánia	semintássir [sûd-essr]	*eighty.*
....	sạggạ́ltama	tesaá	zehétana [sot-tana]	*ninety.*
....	thíbba	míti	bạ́kkạla [baqla]	*one hundred.*
....	thíbba láma	khelíttie míti	kōt bạ́kkạla [kada baqla]	*two hundred.*
....	kúma	shíạhh	álfi [alf]	*one thousand.*
I'lguza	Wāk [Waka-you]	Egziabhér; Egziher	Rạ́bbana	*God.*
ílguza	wāk	sạmái	sémmi [semmi]	*heaven.*
óka	bíftu [adu]	tsehái	ir [îhr]	*sun.*
múgakwa	adhiésa; djíha [djea]	wórhhe	wạ́rhhi [wórhi]	*moon.*
bạ́wa	húrdji [urdi]	kóhhạb	thúi [daui]	*star.*
nía	láfa [lafe]	midr	déchi [dünat]	*earth.*
áya	bisán [bisani]	mái	mi [mëy]	*water.*
zúba	búbie [bube]	nefás	duf	*wind.*
déma	bokáa [roba]	zenáb	rákhmạt; zenáb	*rain.*
masíngela	duméssa [du-mesa]	débena	dána	*cloud.*
dáwi	dírisie	nógwoda	....	*thunder.*
mạngílguza	bekạ́kka [be-keka]	mebrák	....	*lightning.*
mạ́ngia	ibídda [yabid]	hháuwe	esát [essât]	*fire.*
túkwa	ára [ara]	tíes; tíkki	thạn	*smoke.*
dạ́tsagh	ífa [ife]	berhán	béhran	*light.*

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. MAY 9, 1845. No. 34.

Professor WILSON, Vice-President, in the Chair.

The following MS. Glossaries were laid on the table:—

List of provincial words used in the neighbourhood of Alresford, Hants, by the Rev. Brymer Belcher.

Provincialisms of East Kent, by E. Sandys, Esq.

W. Johnson, Esq., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, was elected a Member of the Society.

The following paper was then read:—

"On Onomatopœia." By H. Wedgwood, Esq.

In speculating concerning the origin of language, it has been so much the custom to consider *onomatopœia*, or direct imitation of sounds characteristic of the thing named, as the exceptional case, that words very evidently derived from that source, such as *splash*, *crunch*, *whizz*, *bang*, *thump*, *rap*, &c., have hardly been considered as entitled to the same rank in the language as words in which no imitative character is discernible.

If however language be supposed to have arisen in the ordinary course of nature from the efforts of men to communicate their wants and thoughts to their fellows, it is difficult to conceive any other principle than that of onomatopœia on which it could originally have begun. The only mode in which the voice could be made effective in raising the thought of a certain animal in the mind of a person wholly ignorant of our language, would be to imitate some sound peculiar to the animal in question.

There is a story of an English gentleman, who being desirous of knowing the nature of the meat on his plate at a Chinese entertainment, turned round to the native servant behind him, pointing to the dish with an inquiring *quack, quack*? the China-man replied *bow-wow*: and thus the two parties were mutually intelligible, though they did not understand a word of each other's language. The actual growth of words out of such expressions as these may be witnessed in our nurseries even at the present day. We first imitate the lowing of an ox with the syllable *moo* or *boo*; the cry of the sheep with the syllable *baa*; and these, when subsequently repeated in the ordinary tone in the words *moo-cow*, *baa-lamb*, serve as symbols of the sounds represented, and readily bring the animal intended to the mind of the child, after all attempt at real imitation has entirely vanished.

It is highly probable that the Greek *βους* (pronounced *boose*) has been formed on the same principle with our nursery *moo-cow*, with the exception that in the latter case the imitative syllable has been added on to another name, while in Greek it forms the entire substance of the word.

We can hardly agree with M. Nodier, the author of the 'Onomatopées Françaises,' in attributing a like origin to the name of the boa, until the resemblance in the cry of that kind of serpent to the bellowing of a bull is better established.

The imitative principle of nomenclature is especially common with respect to birds and other animals with which we have little intercourse beyond the occasional sound of their notes. So we have the Night-jar, the Whip-poor-Will, and other American birds unquestionably named from their peculiar cry. In the names of the cuckoo and peewit (G. *kiebitz*), the imitation is still a living principle with every one acquainted with the birds themselves. In that of the owl, Lat. *ulula*, Gr. *ολολυγων*, the reference to the cry of the creature is no longer felt. The same is probably the case with most persons with respect to the Latin *turtur*, which is undoubtedly derived from an imitation of the cooing of a dove, by a repetition of the syllable *tur*, the same sound being represented by a precisely equivalent syllable in the Dutch *korren*, to coo, or croo, as the word was formerly written. It may be observed, that whenever the name of an animal is thus composed of the repetition of one or more syllables, it is almost a certain sign that the principle of onomatopœia has been at work. Thus we have Tuco-tuco, the name of a small rodent in the plains of Buenos Ayres; Ai-ai, one of the sloths, from the cries of those animals respectively. Nor are we without example even of races of men named from an imitation of some peculiarity in their utterance. The first Dutch colonists of the Cape of Good Hope could not fail to be struck with the *click* which forms so marked a feature of the Caffre tongues, and which to a stranger would sound like a perpetual repetition of the syllables *hot* and *tot*. Hence the natives were named by their foreign masters *Hott-en-tot*, *en* in Dutch signifying *and*.

Passing from the names of the animals themselves to those of the peculiar cries in which the different races give vent to their feelings, we shall have little difficulty in recognizing the latter as formed almost exclusively on the principle of imitation, which indeed in such a case could hardly be superseded by any other.

No one can doubt that the *quacking* of ducks, *cackling* of geese, *roaring* of a lion, *neighing* or *whinnying* of a horse, *bellowing* of a bull, *mewing* or *purring* of a cat, *croaking* of frogs and ravens, *cawing* of rooks, *chattering* of magpies and monkeys, *barking*, *yelping*, *howling*, *growling*, *snarling* of dogs, *clucking* of hens, *bleating* of sheep and goats, *twittering* of swallows, *chirping* of crickets or sparrows, *grunting* of pigs, *bumping* of the bittern, or *gobbling* of turkeys, are merely the articulation of sounds employed to imitate the cries or other noises of the animals to which they are applied.

With these may be classed the names of several inarticulate sounds uttered by the human organs, as *laugh*, *cough* (both originally pronounced with a guttural), *sob*, *sigh*, *moan*, *groan*, *hiccough*, *scream*, *shriek*, *yawn*, *snore*, *wheeze*, *sneeze*, *holla*, *whoop*. The imitative character of the last of these is distinctly felt in *hooping-cough*, representing a clear high-pitched cry. Hence *wop*, Old-English, lamentation, and from thence *to weep*, originally no doubt in the sense of *lamenting*, and secondarily in that of shedding tears. The same root may be traced through the Gothic *vopjan*, Latin *vocare*, *to call*, to *vox*, the voice; the *p* passing into a *k* according to the usual genius of the language. The loss of the initial *w* in the Icelandic *op*, outcry, *œpa*, to shout, brings us to the Greek *οψ*, the voice, equivalent to the Latin *vox*.

Another numerous class of words of which the imitative character can hardly be mistaken are those by which we represent the collision or fracture of bodies of a greater or less degree of hardness, or of more or less resonance; the motion of liquids or the air, &c. For example—

clap
rap
tap
knap
snap
frap-per, Fr.
trap
flap
slap
whap

dab
dub
bob
thud, Sc.
clack
crack
knack
smack
thwack
whack

clash.
plash.
flash.
crash.
smash.
dash.
splash.
slash.
rash, Old-Eng.
swash.

bang
ding
ring
twang
clang
din
whine

tramp
thump
bump
plump
knell
bell
boom

drum.
hum.
whirr.
whizz.
buzz.
fizz.
hiss.

It may perhaps be objected, that if the words of the foregoing classes were really derived from imitations of the sounds characteristic of the things designated, we ought to find the same things represented in the cognate languages by closely-resembling words to a far greater extent than is actually the case.

The neighing of a horse is in Fr. *hennir*, It. *nitrire*, Port. and Sp. *rinchar* and *relinchar*, Germ. *wiehern*, Sw. *wrena*, *wrenska*, Dutch *runniken*, *ginniken*, *brieschen*; words in which, if we were ignorant of their meaning, we should find little resemblance, although we can hardly doubt that they are all founded on imitations of the actual sound. The discharge of a gun, which we represent by the syllable *bang*, is commonly imitated in French by *pouf*. The gap between the cries of animals, and still more between inorganic sounds and the articulations of the human voice, is in fact so wide as to allow of a pretty free choice of syllables in which the imitation may be made with nearly equal propriety, and accordingly, in the imitative synonyms of the same or cognate tongues, we must expect only to meet with resemblances of a very general nature: thus we find momentary sounds, such as those produced by the collision of hard bodies, imitated by monosyllables formed of the tenues *p, t, k*,—as *rap, clap, crack*; *rat-a-tat-tat* for the knocking at a door. The collision of bodies of a softer nature and a deader or a hollower sound is imitated by the medials *b, d, g*,—as *dab, thud, swag*; *rub-a-dub-dub* for the beating of a drum.

A final *sh* represents the noise of liquids, or the complex sound arising out of a number of simultaneous elements, as *splash, dash, clash, crash*. The noise made by the motion of the air itself is represented by syllables ending in a guttural: as *sough*, Sc. for the noise of the wind among trees; in *m, z*, or *r*,—as *hum, buzz, whizz, whirr*. The last of these roots may be recognized under slight modifications in the Sc. *gor-cock*, the blackcock; Dutch *kor-hahn*; Sw. *orr-hane*, from the whirring of his wings:—

> Full ninety winters hae I seen,
> And piped where *gor-cocks whirring* flew.—Jamieson.

In Icelandic the corresponding vocable is written *ör*, appearing in the compound *ör-varner*, missiles, *whirr-weapons*, or simply *ör* (gen. *aurva*), in the same sense; also in that of brisk, rapid: hence our *arrow*. In like manner from *hum*, the onomatopœia of a low murmuring sound, we may trace through the Icelandic and Danish the origin of one or two obscure words not commonly explained in our dictionaries. We have Icel. *uma* strepere, *ymia* stridere, *ymr*, the noise of the wind in trees; *ympr, ymptr*, rumor evulgatus; *ympta* rumigerare vel susurrare; *ympte*, Dan. to speak low and soft, *to hint*. From the same root, *uml* Icel., *ymmel* Dan., muttering, whispering, secret talk—an *inkl-ing*.

When the sound which we wish to represent is prolonged with more or less resonance, the imitation ends with *m*, or *n*, or *ng*, or *l*,—letters on which we can dwell for some time in the pronunciation, as *ring, clang, knell, din, boom*.

Modifications in the sound of a different character are represented by a change in the vowel. Thus notes of a low pitch, or sounds produced by the collision of bodies of a considerable surface, are imitated with the vowel *a*, which is pronounced with the most open mouth, and can consequently be uttered with the greatest volume of sound, or with *o*, which approaches nearest to *a* in the foregoing respect. On the other hand, notes of a high pitch, or sounds caused by the collision of small surfaces, are imitated by the vowel *i*, in the utterance of which the air is compressed through the smallest possible passage. We have accordingly *to blare*, or *roar*, for the loud open noise of bulls or lions; to *cheip, peep, chirp*, for the shrill cries of small birds, mice or the like. To *clap, clack* (Fr. *claquer*), for the open sound given by the collision of the palms of the hands; *clip, click*, for the sharp shutting of a pair of scissors, steel spring, or the like; *clank*, the rattling of metallic bodies of considerable size; *clink*, of comparatively small ones, as of pieces of money;

pochen, Ger., to knock at a door; *pick*, *peck* or *tick*, to strike with a small pointed object.

Hence, as the vocable by which we imitate a certain noise is naturally applied to the action or the instrument by which that noise is produced, it is easy to understand how the change from *a* or *o* to *i* has the effect of representing a diminution in the intensity of action or even in the size of material objects. The sound of the foot-fall is imitated in Germ. by the repetition *trapp-trapp-trapp*, from whence *trappa* Isl., *trappen* Dutch, to tread. In the English *tramp* or *trape* a greater degree of emphasis is given to the sound by the insertion of a nasal, or by lengthening the vowel in order to express a more intense kind of action in which each fall of the foot is distinctly heard. To *trip*, on the other hand, with the short compressed vowel, is to tread with a light and quick step. So from *stap*, another imitation of the same sound preserved in the Dutch *stappen*, to step, we have in English the intensitive *stamp*, and in Dutch the diminutive *stippen*, to prick, *stip*, a point, from whence to *stipple*, to mark with a succession of dots. In accordance with the same principle we have *top*, an extremity of considerable size; *tip*, an extremity of comparatively small size; *nob* or *knob*, a rounded end or projection; *knib*, *nipple*, a small and pointed one. In *cat*—*kitten*; *foal*—*filly*, the change from *a* or *o* to *i* corresponds to the diminution in size or strength of the young, or the female as compared with the parent or the male.

Another mode of expressing diminution in the intensity of action, of which we have several examples in English, is by softening down a final *g* (an abrupt ending pronounced with comparative effort) into the gentle breathing of a *w* or *y*. So to *tug* is to pull with interrupted painful effort; to *tow*, to pull with a uniform draught. To *drag* and to *draw*, stand in precisely the same relation to each other. To *wag*, to move backwards and forwards with sudden change of direction; to *weigh* (pronounced *way*), to vibrate with the gradual motion of a pair of scales. To *swag*, as also the *stag* in *stagger*, give the idea of a force applied by jerks; to *sway* and to *stay*, of a steady pressure.

The simplest mode of expressing a repetition or continuance of the same sound is by an actual repetition of the syllable employed to represent it, as *rat-a-tat-tat*, *rub-a-dub-dub*. On this principle are formed the Latin *turtur*, *murmur*, *tintin-abulum*, from *tinnire*, *susurrus*; the Italian *bisbiglio* or *pissi-pissi*, Fr. *chuchotter*. To this class must be referred such expressions as *slap-dash*, *helter-skelter*, Germ. *holter-polter*, *hugger-mugger*, or *hudder-mudder* as it was formerly spelt, originally perhaps meaning *confusedly*, as the Dan. *skudder-mudder*, rack and ruin, confusion; the repetition being intended to represent the succession of noises made by doing a thing in a hasty confused manner,—knocking anything over that comes in the way.

A more usual as well as a more artificial method of representing a rapid succession or continuance of the same sound, is to add to the syllable representing the character of the elementary sound a second syllable composed of an *r* or an *l*,—consonants on which the voice can dwell for a length of time with a more or less sensible vibration,—with an obscure vowel. Thus in the *pattering* of rain, the falling of a rapid succession of drops on a sonorous surface, the sound given by a single drop is imitated by the first syllable *pat*, while the vibration of the *r* in the second syllable serves to represent the continuous hum of the falling shower when the attention is not directed to the individual taps of which the complex sound is made up. So to *clatter* is to do anything accompanied by a succession of claps, or noises that might be imitated by *clap* or *clat*;

to *crackle*, to make a succession of *cracks*;
to *rattle*, ———————— of *raps*;
to *dabble*, ———————— of *dabs*;
to *bubble* or *gurgle*, to make a succession of noises that might be imitated by the syllables *bub* or *gug*.

When once such a principle of expressing continuance or succession was established with respect to sounds or actions accompanied by sound, it would speedily be transferred to cases where no direct imitation of sound is apparent in the simple verb, and thus we have the origin of the ordinary frequentatives in *r* and *l*: as *grapple*, to express a continuance in the act of grabbing or griping; *goggle*, from *gouk*, to stare; *wrestle*, from *wrest*, to twist; *shatter*, from *shake*, &c.

The same effect is frequently produced by a terminating *l* alone, without the vowel, as remarked by Ihre in v. *gnægga*. Thus to *squeak* is to utter a sharp cry of momentary duration; to *squeal*, to utter a prolonged cry of the same character. To *wail*, to utter cries of pain, such as the Germans would represent by the interjection *wehe*! the French *miauler*, to mew, as our *howl* and *growl*, all imply a continuance of action. Here also, as in the regular frequentatives, we find the artifice transferred to cases where there is no reference to audible sound: as in *kneel* from *knee*, *prowl* from Fr. *proie*, prey.

A fertile source of frequentatives in *l* and *r* is to be found in the sounds given by the agitation of liquids under various circumstances. The sound of a single mass of liquid falling on a hard surface is represented by the syllables *squat*, *blot*; the first of the two appearing in the Danish *squatte*, to dash down water, and in our *squat*, crouching down as close to the ground as a mass of liquid, spread out in breadth without height: the second in *blot*, a drop of liquid fallen and spread out; and in the Fr. *se blottir*, to squat, to crouch down. Corresponding to *blot*, we have in the frequentative form to *bludder*, *bluther* (Jamieson), to make a noise with the mouth in taking in liquid, to blot paper in writing (Sw. *pluttra*, *s.s.*), to disfigure the face with weeping; *blether*, idle talk. Pluttra bort penningas (Ihre), to scatter away money, as effectually and irrecoverably as water thrown on the ground. In like manner from *squat* we have to *squatter* (Jamieson), to flutter in water, to pour liquid out of a narrow opening; Sw. *squattra*, to squander away money, precisely in the same sense as *pluttra*; and as from *squatter* we have *squander* by the insertion of an *n*, it seems in the highest degree probable that *plunder* is formed in the same way from a word corresponding to the Sw. *pluttra*, the expression having reference in the first instance to the waste made by the plundering party of the goods belonging to the plundered, while the reference to the profit made by the former would be only a secondary application.

The frequentatives in *it* are in English much less common than those in *el* or *er*: as *racket*, a succession of raps; *cliquetis*, Fr., a clashing or succession of clacks. The second syllable *et* seems to be used as an echo in place of an actual repetition of the elementary sound, and therefore this mode of expressing continuance would in the first instance be applicable only when that sound was of a hard character, such as we have seen articulated with *p*, *t*, or *k*.

The class that next comes under consideration is composed of imitations of the involuntary sounds uttered under the influence of various bodily and mental affections, as pain, cold, terror, disgust, &c. The cry forced from us by a sharp pain is well represented by the German *ach*, our *ah! oh!* From hence we have *ache*, a pain having a tendency to produce that kind of cry; Gr. *αχος*, pain, grief, *αχεω*, *αχνυμι*, &c. A groan from a deeper-seated pain is represented in German by the interjection *wehe*! Anglo-Saxon *wa*! identical with the Latin *væ! vah!* from whence our *woe*, *wail*, *waiment*, Old-English, to lament.

The effects of cold and terror on the human frame seem very nearly identical. The shoulders are shrugged forwards and the arms and closed hands pressed against the chest, while all the muscles of the face and jaw are kept rigid. The deep guttural sound uttered under these circumstances is imitated in English by the interjection *ugh*! expressive of cold or horror. The variations of this sound given by Grimm (iii. 298) are *hu*! *hu*! *hu*! *schu*! *schuck*! *husch*! *hutsch*! *u*! *uk*! (Servian), expressive of cold. From this interjection we had in Old-English and Scotch to *ug*, to feel abhorrence at, to nauseate (Jamieson).

> The rattling drum and trumpet's tout
> Delight young swankies that are stout;
> What his kind frighted mother *ugs*,
> Is music to the soger's lugs.

In a passage of Hardyng cited at the same place, it is said that the abbess of Coldingham having cut off her own nose and lips,

> — counselled all her systers to do the same,
> To make their foes to *houge* so with the sight.
> And so they did, afore the enemies came,
> Echeon their nose and over-lip full right
> Cut off anon, which was an *hougly* sight.

Jamieson rightly observes that this passage clearly points out the origin of our *ugly*, *ugsome*, i. e. what makes the spectator cry *ugh*! what causes abhorrence. The adjective *huge* appears to be founded on the same idea, designating a thing so large as to cause terror, to make us *ug* or *houge* at it, as spelt by Hardyng.

In the verb to *hug* the attention is confined to the bodily action, the constriction of the arms upon the breast, characteristic of cold or terror, without reference to the inward feelings from which it arises. The same root appears extensively in the Gothic tongues, as in the Icel. *uggr*, dread; *oga abominari* (*gruer for*, Dan.), precisely equivalent to the Old-English *to ug*; *ogna* or *ogra*, to terrify; *otte*, dread; *ogan* (Ulph.), to fear, preterite *ohte*, from whence probably the Old-Saxon *for-ohta*, fear, Anglo-Saxon *forht*, fright. It may be questioned whether the above-mentioned *uggr*, terror, *ogra*, to terrify, do not afford a more probable origin of the Ogre of story-books than from *Ouigir*, the name of the tribe that occupied the van in the desolating armies of Chengiz Khan, unless the latter origin can be authenticated by positive evidence.

In *bug*, *bugbear*, an object of dread, North-country *boggart*, Sc. *bogle*, it seems that we have the same root compounded with the particle *be*. Compare *boggart* with Sc. *ogert*, disgust, repugnance. A *buggarty* horse is one apt to take fright.

From *schu*! *schuck*! the other form of the interjection given by Grimm, it is probable, as he suggests, that we have to *shudder*, and the Sc. *scunner*, to shudder with disgust at anything.

The interjection of aversion, *fie! pfui!* is originally in all probability the expression of disgust at an offensive smell, the physical effect of which is to make us close the passage through the nose and exspire strongly through the compressed lips—*faugh*! Hence *puteo*, Fr. *puer*, to stink; *puter* or *putris*, originally stinking, then rotten; Isl. *fuki*, stink; *fúi*, putridity; *fúinn*, putrid. The same root formed into an adjective by a terminating *l* gives *fúll*, Isl. stinking, *foul*. 'Jah fuls ist' (Ulph. Joh. xi. 9), 'By this time he stinketh.' *Fúllsa*, Is., to show disgust at anything; *fúlslegr*, hateful, disgusting, *fulsome*.

From the physically to the morally offensive is an easy step, leading us to the Goth. *fijan*, Isl. *fiá*, to hate, whence our *foe*, *fiend*, *feud*. To proceed with Tooke in the converse direction and derive the interjection from the verb, seems a strange inversion of the natural course of language.

The physical effect of sudden astonishment or admiration, or complete occupation of the attention, is marked in the most striking manner by the involuntary opening of the mouth from the relaxation of all the muscles of the face not engaged in effecting a steady gaze. Hence the frequency with which the gaping of the mouth is referred to as marking intent observation,—entire absorption in an object:

> I saw a smith stand with his hammer—thus—
> The whilst his iron did on his anvil cool,
> *With open mouth* swallowing a tailor's news.—K. John.

Now the simple utterance of the voice through the parting lips would give rise to the syllable *ba*, and it is probable that the Greek and Latin interjections βαβαι! *babæ*! *papæ*! are merely repetitions of that sound representing the opening of the mouth under the influence of wonder or admiration. From *ba* with a final *d*, to avoid the hiatus, we have in Provençal (as doubtless originally in Italian) *badar*, to open or gape; *gola badada*, with gaping mouth; whence *badaud*, Fr. a gaper, a foolish person. In modern Italian (as in the French *bailler*) the sense of gaping is expressed by the frequentative form *sbadigliare*, while the primitive *badare* is used only in the moral applications, expressing in the first place entire attention, and secondarily loitering, waiting, delay. There can be no question that this is the same with the Gothic *beidan*, to look out for, wait for, expect—to bide. To *abide*, is to look out till the thing happens. The active sense of *abide* was formerly much more strongly felt than it is at present. In Wiclif it is constantly used where our present version substitutes *to look for*.

Home is he brought and laid in sumptuous bed,
Where many skilful leeches him *abide* (*i. e.* attend on him)
To salve his hurts.—F. Q. iv. 27.

In Old French it is probable that the sensible image represented by the syllable *ba* was still recognized in the use of *baer* (without the *d*), *béer* signifying to gape; *esbahir*, to cause to gape, to astonish, whence Chaucer's *abaw* and the modern *abash*. In Old-French we find *béer*, *baier* used also in moral applications corresponding exactly to those of the Italian *badare*, to listen to, to be intent upon anything, entirely occupied with it:

Tous baiaient a la servir
Por l'amor di li desservir.—R. R. 1043.

All besy werin her to serve,
For that they would her love deserve.—Chaucer.

So *abayer* is rendered to listen to, to wait for with open mouth, inhiare loquenti, *abeyance*, attendre quelqu'un avec empressement (Lacombe). Hence our *abeyance*, a state of expectation or dependence upon anything, and the Old-English *abie*, in the same sense as *abide*, to endure or remain:

At sight of her they suddeine all arose
In great amaze, ne wist which way to chuse,
But Jove all feareless forced them to *aby* (i. e. *remain*).—F. Q.

Hence also our expression of *standing at bay* (which has nothing to do with *aux abois*), precisely equivalent to the Italian *stare a bada*, to stand at gaze, intently watching anything, completely taken up with it:

Ne was there man so strong but he down bore,
Ne woman yet so fair but he her brought
Unto his bay, and captived her thought.—F. Q.

The Scotch *abeigh* represents the state of a person gazing at a distance on the object of his desire or attention.

After tracing from an onomatopœia the expression of an idea apparently so remote from any connexion with sound as simple continuance or endurance, it would be hard to say where we need despair. The difficulty is to light on the fountain-head. From thence it is easy to follow the stream downwards through a long train of derivatives; but when we look back from the signification finally attained, the sensible image at the source of the metaphor is apt to appear so strong a caricature of the corresponding features in the object to which it gives a designation, as to prejudice our hearers against our conclusion, and too often to deter them from following us step by step through the investigation which is necessary to establish that conclusion on a solid basis.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. MAY 23, 1845. No. 35.

Professor WILSON, Vice-President, in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table:—

"A Grammar of the Berber Language," by F. H. Newman, Esq.: presented by the author.

"Apposition and Prolusiones Literariæ of St. Paul's School for 1845:" presented by the Rev. H. Kynaston.

Two papers were then read:—

1. "On the North Anglian Dialect." By John Mitchell Kemble, Esq.

In speaking of the Anglo-Saxon language, scholars universally intend that particular form of speech in which all the principal monuments of our most ancient literature are composed, and which, with very slight variations, is found in Beowulf and Cædmon, in the Exeter and Vercelli Codices, in the translation of the Gospels and Homilies, and in the works of Ælfred the Great. For all general purposes this nomenclature is sufficiently exact; and in this point of view, the prevalent dialect, which contains the greatest number of literary remains, may be fairly called the Anglo-Saxon language, of which all varying forms were dialects. It is however obvious that this is in fact an erroneous way of considering the subject: the utmost that can be asserted is, that Ælfred wrote his own language, viz. that which was current in Wessex; and that this, having partly through the devastations of heathen enemies in other parts of the island, partly through the preponderance of the West-Saxon power and extinction of the other royal families, become the language of the one supreme court, soon became that of literature and the pulpit also.

In order to come to a just conclusion respecting the subject of the following pages, it is necessary clearly to conceive the nature and character of what we call dialects. The Doric, Æolic, and Ionic for example, in the language of grammarians, are dialects of the Greek: to what does this assertion amount? To this only, that among a people called the Greeks, some being Dorians spoke a language called Doric, some being Æolians spoke another language called Æolic, while a third class, Ionians, spoke a third language called, from them, Ionic. But though all these are termed dialects of the Greek, it does not follow that there was ever a Greek language of which these were variations, and which had any being apart from these. Dialects then are essentially languages: and the name dialect itself is but a convenient grammarian's phrase, invented as part of the machinery by which to carry on reasonings respecting languages. We learn the language which has the best and largest literature extant; and having done so, we treat all very nearly resembling languages as *variations* from what we have learnt. And that dialects are in truth several languages, will readily appear to any one who perceives the progressive development of the principle of separation in cognate tongues. The language of the Bavarian highlander or High Dutch, the language of the Hanoverian lowlander or Low Dutch, are German dialects: elevate, as it is called, regulate and purify the one, and it assumes the name and character of a language—it is German.. Transplant the other to England, let nine centuries pass over it, and it becomes a language too, and a language of more importance than any which was ever yet spoken in the world, it has become English. Yet none but practised philologists can acknowledge the fact that the German and English languages are dialects of one Teutonic tongue.

These considerations are not without their importance. On the full comprehension of them depends the reception of a fact without the knowledge and continual presence of which the inquirer can only expect perplexity and confusion. That fact is, the completeness and consistency of dialects, in other words, their *spontaneity*. Those who imagine language invented by a man or men, originally confined and limited in its powers, and gradually enlarged and enriched by continuous practice and the reflection of wise and learned individuals—unless indeed they look upon it as potentially only—in *posse* though not in *esse*, as the tree may be said to exist in the seed, though requiring time and culture to flourish in all its majesty—appear to neglect the facts which history proves. There is nothing more certain than this, that the earlier we can trace back any one language, the more full, complete, and consistent are its forms; that the later we find it existing, the more compressed, colloquial and business-like it has become. Like the trees of our forests, it grows at first wild, luxuriant, rich in foliage, full of light and shadow, and flings abroad in its vast branches the fruits of a vigorous youthful nature: transplanted into the garden of civilization and trained for purposes of commerce, it becomes regulated, trimmed and pruned; nature indeed still gives it life, but art prescribes the direction and extent of its vegetation. Compare the Sanscrit with the Gothic, the Gothic with the Anglo-Saxon, and again the Anglo-Saxon with the English: or what is even better, take two periods of the Anglo-Saxon itself, the eighth and tenth centuries for example. Always we perceive a compression, a gradual loss of fine distinctions, a perishing of forms, terminations and conjugations, in the younger state of the language. The truth is, that in language up to a certain period, there is a real indwelling vitality, a principle acting unconsciously but pervasively in every part: men wield their forms of speech as they do their limbs, spontaneously, knowing nothing of their construction, or the means by which these instruments possess their power. There are flexors and extensors long before the anatomist discovers and names them, and we use our arms without inquiring by what wonderful mechanism they are made obedient to our will. So is it with language long before the grammarian undertakes its investigation. It may even be said, that the commencement of the age of self-consciousness is identical with the close of that of vitality in language; for it is a great error to speak of languages as dead, only when they have ceased to be spoken. They are dead when they have ceased to possess the power of adaptation to the wants of the people, and no longer contain in themselves the means of their own extension. The Anglo-Saxon, in the spirit and analogy of his whole language, could have used words which had never been heard before, and been at once understood: if we would introduce a new name for a new thing, we must take refuge in the courtesy of our neighbours, and borrow from the French, or Greek or Latin, terms, which never cease to betray their foreign origin, by never putting off the forms of the tongue from which they were taken, or assuming those of the tongue into which they are adopted. The English language is a dead one.

In general it may be said that dialects possess this vitality in a remarkable degree, and that their very existence is the strongest proof of its continuance. This is peculiarly the case when we use the word to denote the popular or provincial forms of speech in a country where, by common consent of the learned and educated classes, one particular form of speech has been elevated to the dignity of the national language. It is then only the strength of the principles which first determined the peculiarities of the dialect that continues to support them, and preserves them from being gradually rounded down, as stones are by friction, and confounded in the course of a wide-spreading centralization. Increased opportunity of intercommunion with other provincials or the metropolis, (dependent upon increased facilities of locomotion, the improvement of roads and the spread of mechanical inventions), sweeps away much of these original distinctions, but it never destroys them all. This is a necessary consequence of the fact that they are in some degree connected with the physical features of the country itself, and all those causes which influence the atmosphere. A sort of pseudo-vitality even till late periods bears witness to the indwelling power, and the consciousness of oppression from without: *false* analogies are the form this life assumes. How often have we not heard it asserted that particular districts were remarkable for the Saxonism of their speech, because they had retained the archaisms, *kine, shoon, housen*! Well and good! Archaisms they are, but they are false forms nevertheless, based upon an analogy just as erroneous as that which led men in the last century to say *crowed, hanged* for *crew, hung*. The Anglo-Saxon language never knew any such forms, and one wonders not to find by their side equally gratuitous Saxonisms, *mousen, lousen*. No doubt the peasant in many districts speaks as his forefathers ten centuries ago spoke. The Norfolk hostler, who said to his terrier (who was at the moment rubbing herself against one sunny wall as he was against another), "*If yow due bleănder so abaowt old bitch, yow'll bi molten: yow'll molt yusself!*" spoke very nearly as the East-Anglian peasant spoke in the time of Ælfred: but he did so, partly because, whatever the original disposing causes of dialect are, tradition perpetuates them, and because the same natural features of the country produce the same results upon the dwellers in the same localities. Professor Schmeller's Dictionary of the present Bavarian dialect is a most valuable aid to us in reading the productions of the Old-German muse, because the Bavarian peasant of today, shut up in his mountains, has retained unchanged the characteristics of a language which civilization has elsewhere changed: the same learned inquirer's journey to the Sette and Quindeci Commune revealed in the midst of Italy an isolated hill-population speaking, in some respects, the German of the tenth century. 'Tim Bobbin,' the 'Exmoor Scolding,' Forby's 'East-Anglian Vocabulary,' Wilbraham's 'Cheshire Remains,' all have a high philological value, not merely because they furnish here and there a word wanting in our Anglo-Saxon dictionaries, but because they show the same characters in the dialects of our day which existed in the *languages* of different kingdoms a thousand years back, and because they throw a broad stream of light upon the history of language itself.

Professor Willis of Cambridge, in the course of some most ingenious experiments upon the organization and conditions of the human larynx, came upon the law which regulated the pronunciation of the vowels. He found this to be partly in proportion to the size of the opening in the pipe, partly to the force with which the air was propelled through it, and by the adaptation of a tremulous artificial larynx to the pipe of an organ, he produced the several vowels at will. Now bearing in mind the difference between the living organ and the dead one, the susceptibility of the former to dilatation and compression, from the effects, not only of the human will, but also of cold, of denser or thinner currents of air, and above all the influence which the general state of the body must have upon every part of it, we are furnished at once with the necessary hypothesis; viz. that climate, and the local positions on which climate much depends, are the main agency in producing the original variations of dialect. Once produced, tradition perpetuates them, with subsequent modifications proportionate to the change in the original conditions, the migration to localities of a different character, the congregation into towns, the cutting down of forests, the cultivation of the soil, by which the prevalent degrees of cold and the very direction of the currents of air are in no small degree altered. It is clear that the same influences will apply to all such consonants as can in any way be affected by the greater or less tension of the organs, consequently above all to the gutturals; next to the palatals, which may be defined by the position of the tongue; least of all to the labials, and generally to the liquids also, though these may be more or less strongly pronounced by different peoples. This hint must suffice here, as the pursuit of it is rather a physiological than a philological problem, and it is my business rather to show historically what facts bear upon my present inquiry, than to investigate the philosophical reasons for their existence. Still, for the very honour of human nature, one of whose greatest and most universal privileges is the recognition of and voluntary subjection to the laws of beauty and harmony, it is necessary to state that no developed language exists which does not acknowledge some internal laws of euphony, from which many of its peculiarities arise, and which by these assimilates its whole practice and assumes an artistical consistency. On this faculty, which is rather to be considered as a moral quality of the people than a necessity of their language, depends the facility of employing the language for certain purposes of art, and the form which poetry and rhythm shall assume in the period of their cultivation.

In reviewing the principal languages of the ancient and modern world, where the migrations of those that spoke them can be traced with certainty, we are struck with the fact that the dwellers in chains of mountains or on the elevated plains of hilly districts, strongly affect broad vowels and guttural consonants. Compare the German of the Tyrol, Switzerland or Bavaria with that of the lowlands of Germany, Westphalia, Hanover and Mecklenburg: compare the Doric with the Attic, or still more the soft Ionic Greek: follow the Italian of our own day into the mountains of the Abruzzi: pursue the English into the hills of Northumberland; mark the characteristics of the Celtic in the highlands of Wales and Scotland, of the Vascongado, in the hilly ranges of Spain. Everywhere we find the same type; everewhere the same love for broad sounds and guttural forms ; everywhere these appear as the peculiarity of mountaineers. The difference of latitude between Holstein and Inspruck is not great; that between Newcastle and Coventry is less ; Sparta is more southerly than Athens ; Crete more so than either; but this does not explain our problem; its solution is found in the comparative number of feet above the level of the sea, in the hills and the valleys which they enclose.

It is the object of the following pages to give an account of one particular language once spoken in England, at the period when Northumberland, the kingdom in which it prevailed, stood at the head of all Teutonic Europe, through its cultivation of all the branches of learning then prized: the country which numbered Beda and Wilfrið of York among its children ; and which, although the misfortune of civil war and foreign conquests early put a stop to its national development, has yet left us in the monuments which survive, convincing proofs of the high moral cultivation of its inhabitants. The Northumbrian language is now for the first time since eleven centuries, assuming the station and attracting the attention which it merits; the deciphering of ancient inscriptions, and the publication of ancient manuscripts, are daily adding to the store of our documents; and for philological purposes, it is, not only on account of its antiquity, the most interesting of all the forms of speech which were current among our Anglo-Saxon progenitors, but it supplies some very important links, which without it we should miss in the historical development of the Teutonic dialects. It is proposed to take the several subjects connected with it in order: and as the space which will be necessary to do this efficiently will exceed the limits of a single paper, it will be well to confine ourselves this evening to the first division of the subject, viz. the vowels. The consonants, the declension and conjugation, and some characteristic peculiarities of the syntax, must be reserved for other occasions.

The monuments of the language upon which the remarks that follow are founded, are of three different classes. The first class consist of inscriptions upon stones, principally in Runic characters, and of uncertain, but probably very great antiquity. The second class consist merely of proper names found upon coins, and whose date may usually be determined with accuracy. The third class are MSS. written in Northumberland, and in general capable of being referred with certainty to particular periods. The two latter classes supply us with some of the oldest, as well as the latest specimens of the dialect. Of these three, the second seems the least trustworthy: and this may be accounted for by the supposition that foreign moneyers, not perfectly acquainted with the dialect, must frequently have been employed in the coinage. The perfection of the Runic alphabet, and its capability of expressing every difference both of vowel and consonant, renders the inscriptions on crosses, etc. particularly valuable, and it is impossible to refrain from the expression of regret that their extent should be so limited as it is. But it is to the third class that we must look for any complete and systematic purview of the Northumbrian dialect, and it is fortunate that from the great quantity of materials we are enabled to lay a sure basis and firm foundation for our work. The following are the principal MSS. which may be made use of for the construction of a grammar and the selection of specimens.

The commencement of Cædmon, from early MSS. of Ælfred's Beda. This remarkable monument of language, which dates from the middle to the end of the seventh century, is, with the exception of the Gothic translation of the New Testament by Ulphilas, and one or two more trifling fragments of Gothic, the earliest specimen of any Teutonic language in existence. There is not the slightest reason for doubting its being as old as it professes to be, or admitting the opinion of those who would represent it as a modern and corrupt version of an older text. Next in point of age and importance are the lines quoted by Beda on his death-bed, and which, in their present shape, may safely be referred to the year 737; the manuscript at St. Gall, from which the copy here made use of was taken, being very little, if at all, younger than the first half of the eighth century. They are printed in the 'Archæologia,' No. 28, Art. 12.

The Durham Evangeles, the magnificent volume known as St. Cuthbert's or the Durham Book (Brit. Mus. Cott. Nero, D, 4.), though perhaps not the next in point of antiquity, is, from the great mass of materials which it supplies, of more importance than any other monument we possess. Like a majority of our early authorities, it contains only Saxon glosses upon a Latin text. The *text* of the Durham book may safely be assigned to as early a date as 686–690, or the very close of the seventh century: and gladly would we assume, if possible, an equal antiquity for the gloss. But this desire, so common and so pardonable, must yield to the force of evidence which cannot be gainsaid. A series of entries recording the names of those to whose pious labours the execution of the work was due, enables us to ascertain with sufficient precision the date of its completion. Ælfsige, bishop of Lindisfarn, and Aldred, provost of the convent, were the two clergymen whose zeal was most conspicuous in the work. The former of these was elected to the see in the year 968, and died exactly twenty years later: so that the execution of this book must be placed between those two years. With slight variations in the style of execution and in the language, the characters of the gloss are the same as those employed in the Durham Ritual, next to the Evangeles the most extensive monument of pure Northumbrian which we possess. But the date of the Ritual can be fixed with perfect certainty. It contains four collects which Aldred the provost composed for Bishop Ælfsige, and which are thus alluded to:—

Be sūðan Wudigan gæte æt A'clee on Westsæxum on Laurentius Mæssan daegi on Wodnes dægi Ælfsige ðǽm biscópe in his getelde Aldred se profast ðás feower collectæ on fíf næht áld[ne] mona ǽr underne áwrát.

Now in the year 970, St. Lawrence's day fell on a Wednesday, and the moon was five days old, characteristics which do not apply to any other year within the period of Ælfsige's episcopate: we thus obtain tolerably accurate dates both for the Evangeles and the Ritual; and with them, the most convincing proof that during a period of three centuries the peculiarities of the Northumbrian language continued to maintain themselves. The Durham Ritual has been published by the Rev. Joseph Stevenson.

With respect to the beautiful Psalter (MS. Brit. Muss. Cott. Vesp. A. 1.), we are not so fortunate. From the exquisite execution of the text, which is entirely composed of Roman capital letters, we should be inclined to attribute it to a far earlier date, to assign it to the seventh century at latest. But this must remain merely conjecture, in the absence of all positive data. A far more important question remains to be answered. Is the language found in the glosses of the Durham Evangeles and Ritual, or those of the Psalter, to be considered the pure Northumbrian? Are the points of difference between these monuments to be attributed to external influences, or are they the natural consequences of the MSS. belonging to different localities?

The country called by the Anglo-Saxons Northumberland, and which may loosely be said to have extended from the Humber to Edinborough, and from the North Sea to the hills of Cumberland, was peopled by tribes of Angles. Such at least is the tradition reported by Beda, who adds that Kent was first settled by Jutes. Who these Jutes were is not clearly ascertained, but from various circumstances it may be inferred that there was at least a considerable admixture of Frisians amongst them. Hengest, the supposed founder of the Kentish kingdom, is a Frisian hero, and Jutes, "ëotenas," is a usual name for the Frisians in Bëówulf. Beda, it is true, does not enumerate Frisians among the Teutonic races by which England was colonized, but this omission is repaired by the far more valuable evidence of Procopius, who, living at the time of some great invasion of Britain by the Germans, expressly numbers Frisians among the invaders. Now the Anglo-Saxon traditions themselves, however obscurely they may express it, point to a close connection between Kent and Northumberland: the latter country, according to these traditions, was colonized from Kent, and for a long time received its rulers or dukes from that kingdom. Without attaching to this legend more importance than it deserves, we may conclude that it asserts an original communion between the tribes that settled in the two countries; and consequently, if any Frisic influence is found to operate in the one, it will be necessary to inquire whether a similar action can be detected in the other. This will be of some moment hereafter, when we enter upon a more detailed examination of the dialect. The most important peculiarity in which the Durham Evangeles and Ritual differ from the Psalter is the form of the infinitive mood in verbs. This in the Durham books is, with exception of one verb, bián *esse*, invariably formed in -*a*, not in -*an*, the usual form in all the other Anglo-Saxon dialects. Now this is also a peculiarity of the Frisic, and of the Old-Norse, and is found in no other Germanic tongue; it is then an interesting inquiry, whether the one or the other of these tongues is the origin of this peculiarity; whether, in short, it belongs to the old, the original Frisic form which prevailed in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries, or whether it is owing to Norse influence, acting in the ninth and tenth, through the establishment of Danish invaders and a Danish dynasty in the countries north of the Humber.

In general the history of language impels us to believe all contractions of form to be of comparatively later introduction. Were we called upon to decide whether *hæbba* or *hæbban* were the older formation, all analogy would lead us to declare in favour of the latter; for languages lose but rarely gain forms in their progress towards grammatical times. And hence, when we find the Gothic of the fourth, the Anglo-Saxon of the seventh, the Old-German and Old-Saxon of the ninth centuries, all in possession of the infinitive in -*n*, while only the Old-Norse and Frisic are without that form, we cannot but think that those two languages have deflected from the general type. But again, our monuments of Norse have no such antiquity even as the ninth century, and the oldest Frisic we know dates from about the twelfth: nay, more, it is not unreasonable to attribute to the Norse, the appearance of this peculiarity in Frisic. If now we examine the monuments of Northumbrian itself, we find in the earliest of all, the infinitive hergan *laudare*, not herga, while in the Psalter, whose date, though uncertain, is unquestionably much earlier than that of the Evangeles and Ritual, the infinitive is never otherwise formed. The Ruthwell Cross does indeed present us with three or four instances of infinitives in -*a*, but then we are ignorant of the period at which that cross was executed, and even if we refer it to the end of the ninth century, we shall allow nearly a hundred years from the first advent of the Danes in Northumberland, a space quite sufficient to have produced a change of the description in question. On a full consideration of these circumstances, it may be concluded that this peculiarity in two books dating from nearly the end of the tenth century, is not organic, that is to say, not original in the dialect, but owing to the influence of the Norse settlers in Northumberland; a conclusion which opens the way to the reception of other monuments as true and genuine specimens of the Northumbrian tongue. Other proofs of a cogent nature may be adduced in confirmation of this view. In one passage of the Evangeles, *fretum* is explained by the double gloss *luh* vel *lagu*. Now it is a singular but important fact, that these two apparently distinct forms are in reality but one word, the former being the Norse, the latter the Saxon way of pronouncing it. Again, nothing can be more characteristic of the Scandinavian family of languages than the prefixing *æt* to infinitives, a peculiarity wanting in all the other Teutonic tongues. Nevertheless in the Durham Evangeles we find æt eatta, *manducare*. That other striking peculiarities of the Scandinavian tongues, such as the postponed article, *ἄρθρον ὑποτασσόμενον*, were not adopted by the Northumbrians, proves only the strong root their national language had in their feelings.

The MS. (Brit. Mus. Reg. 2. A. xx.), which appears to have formerly been part of a MS. now in the Cambridge University Library (Ll. 1. 10.), can hardly be of later date than the ninth century. Its glosses contain the Northumbrian dialect in tolerable purity, though much carelessness is evident in the manner of their execution: in these two MSS. the infinitive is formed in *-an* or *-en*, never in *-a*.

On the whole then the Durham Book and the Ritual must be considered as less accurate specimens of the Northern Angle dialect than the Psalter, Vesp. A. 1; and the latter is probably an earlier as well as more correct monument of the language, compiled either before the Northmen had exercised any influence upon the pure Northumbrian, or by some person removed from the sphere of that influence.

We have seen that the Evangeles and Ritual date about the year 970. But the year 801 witnessed the advent upon the shores of Northumberland of that frightful scourge which was to turn the best cultivated district of England into a wilderness; Lindisfarn was sacked by the Northmen, and not long after, Wearmouth, and other monuments of ecclesiastical splendour or piety, perished under the same ruthless hands. Gradually all Northumberland ceased to be English: the bishops and their clergy fled: the nobles were either rooted out, or after a generation or two, became confounded with the invaders. Intestine broils and civil wars completed the desolation of the country. During this period the dialect of the people might well lose something of its purity, and indeed it is wonderful that it should have lost no more than it has. The writer of the glosses to the Psalter either lived at an early stage of the Norse rule, or he was one of those clergymen who left the country to escape the destruction with which the religious houses were especially threatened; his language therefore, in all cases where it differs from the Evangeles, may be concluded to offer a more correct and truer representation of the Northumbrian type.

The Ruthwell Cross has been already described at great length inthe 'Archæologia,' v. 28, art. 12: to that paper reference may be made for a description of it: nor need we on this occasion enter into any consideration of coins. Having thus reviewed a portion of the materials which have been made use of, we can proceed to the results themselves; premising that we confine ourselves to the period previous to the Norman conquest. There is reason to hope that Mr. Garnett will carry on the inquiry on some future occasion, and develope the peculiarities of the Northern tongue in the Middle-English period, the monuments of which are both interesting and numerous.

2. Bibliographical Notice of the Works on the Provincialisms of Holland and Friesland. From papers by Van den Bergh and Hettema in the *Taalkundig Magazijn*. Extracted by R. G. Latham, M.D. Subsidiary to the illustration of the English Provincial Dialects.

PART I.—HOLLAND, &c.

Van den Bergh, *Taal. Mag.* ii. 2. 193–210.

GRONINGEN.—Laurman, *Proeve van kleine taalkundige bijdragen tot beter kennis van den tongval in de Provincie Groningen.*—Groningen, 1822.

J. Sonius Swaagman, *Comment: de dialecto Groningana, etc.: una cum serie vocabulorum, Groninganis propriorum.*—Groning. 1827.

Zaamenspraak tusschen Pijter en Jaap dij malkáár op de weg ontmuiten boeten Stÿntilpoorte.—Groninger Maandscrift, No. 1. Also in Laurman's *Proeve.*

Nieuwe Schuitpraatjes.—By the same author, 1836.

List van Groningsche Woorden.—By A. Complementary to the works of Laurman and Swaagman. With notes by A. de Jager.—Taalkundig Magazijn, second part, third number, pp. 331–334.

Groninsch Taaleigen door J. A. (the author of the preceding list). Taalkundig Magazijn, iv. 4. pp. 657–690.

Raize na Do de Cock.—Known to Van den Bergh only through the newspapers.

Subdialects indicated by J. A. as existing, (*a*) on the Friesland frontier, (*b*) in the Fens.

L. Van Bolhuis.—Collection of Groningen and Ommeland words not found in Halma's Lexicon; with notes by Clignett, Steenwinkel, and Malnoe. MS. In the library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

OVER-IJSEL.—J. H. Halbertsma, *Proeve van een Woordenboekje van het Overijselsch.*—Overijsselschen Almanak voor Oudheid en Letteren, 1836.

M. Winhoff, *Landrecht var Auerissel, tweede druk, met veele* (philological as well as other) *aanteekingen door J. A. Chalmot.*—Campen, 1782.

T. W. Van Marle, *Samensprôke tusschen en snaak zoo as der gelukkig néèt in de menigte zint en en heeren-krecht déè gien boe of ba zé, op de markt te Déventer van vergange vrijdag.*—Overijselschen Almanak, &c. *ut supra.*

Over de Twenthsche Vocalen en Klankwijzigingen, door J. H. Behrens.—Taalkundig Magazijn, iii. 3. pp. 332–390. 1839.

Twenther Brul'fteleed.—Overijsselschen Almanak.

Dumbar the Younger (?).—Three lists of words and phrases used principally at Deventer. MS. In the library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Drawings of twelve Overijssel Towns. Above and beneath each a copy of verses in the respective dialects. MS. of the seventeenth century. Library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

GELDERLAND.—H. I. Swaving, *Opgave van eenige in Gelderland gebruikelijke woorden.*—Taalkundig Magazijn, i. 4. pp. 305.

Ibid.—*Ibid.* ii. 1. pp. 76–80.

Opmerkingen omtrent den Gelderschen Tongval.—*Ibid.* ii. 4. pp. 398—426. The fourth section is devoted to some peculiarities from the neighbourhood of Zutphen.

N. C. Kist, *Over de ver wisslingvan zedelijke en zinnelijke Hoedanigheden in sommige Betuwsche Idiotismen.*—Nieuwe Werken der Maatsch. van Nederl. Letterkund. iii. 2. 1834.

Staaltje van Graafschapsche landtal.—*Proeve van Taalkundige Opmerkingen en Bedenkingen, door* T. G. C. Kalckhoff.—Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen for June 1826.

Appendix to the above.—*Ibid.* October 1826.

Het Zeumerroaisel: a poem. 1834?—Known to Van den Bergh only through the newspapers. Believed to have been published in 1834.

Et Schaassen-riejen, en praotparticken tussen Harmen en Barteld.—Geldersche Volks-Almanak, 1835. Zutphen Dialect.

De Öskeskermios.—Geldersche Volks-Almanak, 1836. Dialect of Over Veluwe.

Hoe Meister Maorten baordman baos Joosten en schat deevinden.—Geldersche Volks-Almanak, 1836. Dialect of Lijm.

Opgave van eenige in Gelderland gebruikelijke woorden ac.—H. I. Swaving.—Taalk. Mag. iv. 4. pp. 307–330.

Aantekeningen ter verbetering en uitbreiding der opmerkingen omtrent den Gelderschen Tongval.—Taal. Mag. iii. 1. pp. 39–80.

A. Van den Bergh.—Words from the provincial dialects of the Veluwen; with additions by H. T. Folmer.—MS. Library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Handbook, containing the explanation and etymology of several obscure and antiquated words, &c. occurring in the Gelderland and other neighbouring Law-books.—By J. C. C. V. H[asselt].—MS. Library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

HOLLAND.—*Scheeps-praat, ten overlijden van Prins Maurits van Orange.*—Huygens Korenbloemem, B. viii. Also in Lulofs Nederlandsche Spraakkunst, p. 351; in the Vaderlandsche Spreekworden door Sprenger van Eyk, p. 17, and (with three superadded couplets) in the Mnemosyne, part x. p. 76.

Brederoos Kluchten.—Chiefly in the Low Amsterdam (*plat Amsterdamsch*) dialect.

Hooft, *Warenar met den pot.*

Suffr. Sixtinus.—*Gerard van Velsen.* Amst. 1687.

Bilderdijk, *Over een oud Amsterdamsch Volksdeuntjen.*—Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen, 1808. Reprinted, with an appendix, at Leyden, 1824.

Bilderdijk, *Rowbeklag; in gemeen Zamen Amsterdamschen tongval.* —Najaarsbladen, part i.

Gebel, *Scheviningsch Visscherslied.*—Almanak voor Blijgeestigen.

1. *Boertige Samenspraak, ter heilgroete bij een huwelijk.*

2. *Samenspraak over de harddraverij te Valkenburg en aan het Haagsche Schouw.*

3. *Boertige Samenspraak tusschen Heeip en Jan-buur.*—These three last-named poems occur in Gedichten van J. Le Francq van Berkhey, in parts i. 221, ii. 180, ii. 257 respectively.

Tuist tusschen Achilles en Agamemnon. Schiutpraatje van eenen boer; of luimige vertaling van het 1e *Boek der Ilias,* by J. E. Van Varelen. —Mnemosyne, part iv. Dordrecht, 1824.

The same by H. W. and B. F. Tydeman in the Mnemosyne, part iv. Dordrecht, 1824.

Noordhollandsch Taaleigen, door Nicolas Beets.—Taalk. Magaz. iii. 4. pp. 510–516, and iv. 3. pp. 365–372.

List of words and phrases used by the Katwijk Fishermen.—MS. Library of the Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Dictionary of the North-Holland Dialect; chiefly collected by Agge Roskan Kool.—MS. *Ibid.*

ZEALAND.—*Gedicht op 't innemen van sommige schansen en de sterke stad Hulst, &c.* 1642. Le Jeune; Volkszangen, p. 190.

Brief van eene Zuidbevelandsche Boerin, aan haren Zoon, dienende bij de Zeeuwsche landelijke Schutterij. Zeeuwsche Volks-Almanak, 1836.

Over het Zeeuwsche Taaleigen, door Mr. A. F. Sifflé.—Taalkundig Magazijn i. 2. 169–174.

Notes upon the same, by Van A. D. J[ager].—*Ibid,* p. 175–177.

Taalkundige Aanteekeningen, door Mr. J. H. Hoefft.—Ibid. 1. 3. 248–256.

Collection of words used in Walcheren.—MS. Library of Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

Collection of words used in States-Flanders.—MS. *Ibid.*

NORTH BRABANT.—J. H. Hoefft, *Proeve van Bredaasch taaleigen, &c.*—Breda, 1836.

J. L. Verster, Words used in the Mayoralty of Bosch.—MS. Library of Maatschappij van Nederlandsche Letterkunde.

JEWISH.—*Khootje, Waar binje? hof Conferensje hop de vertrekkie van de Colleesje hin de Poortoegeesche Koffy' uyssie, hover de gemasqwerde bal ontmaskert.*—Amsterd.

Lehrrhede hower de vrauwen, door Raphael Noenes Karwalje, Hopper Rhabbijn te Presburg; in Wibmer, de Onpartijdige.—Amst. 1820, p. 244.

NEGRO*.—*New Testament.*—Copenhagen, 1781, and Barby, 1802.

The Psalms.—Barby, 1802.

---

* From *Taal. Mag.* iii. 4. 500. In the 86th number of the Quarterly Review we find extracts from a New Testament for the use of the Negroes of Guiana, in the Talkee-talkee dialect. In this there is a large infusion of Dutch, although the basis of the language is English.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. JUNE 13, 1845. NO. 36.

Rev. H. JENKYNS REES in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table:—

"A Grammar of the Cree Language," by the Rev. J. Howe. Presented by the Geographical Society.

"A MS. List of Provincialisms used in the neighbourhood of Ropsley, Lincolnshire," by Mr. John Allen. Presented by Dr. Latham.

"A MS. List of Cleaveland Words," by the Rev. John Oxlee. Presented by Dr. Latham.

Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, Florence, was elected a member of the Society.

A paper was then read:—

"On the North-Anglian Dialect" (*continued*). By John Mitchell Kemble, Esq.

The object of the few remarks which follow, is the development of the vowel system in the Northumbrian or Northern Angle dialect. It will form the first of a series of short papers upon the peculiarities of that dialect, of its vowel and consonant relations, its declensions and conjugations, and some startling phænomena in its syntax.

In order to render this investigation useful, and indeed intelligible, it will be necessary to institute a comparison between this and other Teutonic forms; to dive, in short, to some extent into the comparative anatomy of the Anglo-Saxon itself: and this appears the more desirable, because, in spite of a certain outward activity which has always existed and does yet exist in England with regard to that language, there is reason to suspect that very few persons indeed have penetrated its secret, or possess any beyond the merest superficial acquaintance with its philological character. And as, in giving any account of what in grammatical parlance we call dialects or variations, we necessarily assume a fixed standard from which to measure deflections, we shall take the West-Saxon dialect as that standard, partly because it is the most familiar of all the Anglo-Saxon languages to the student, having been made the nearly exclusive subject of grammars and text-books; and partly because the finest poetical remains of our early indigenous literature, whether they be translations or not, are found in it; which poetical remains contain traces of a peculiar language which seems not to have maintained itself the moment the heathen mythus and epos ceased to leave traces of their influence, and which is not found at all in Anglo-Saxon prose writing.

But it is not enough for us to institute this comparison, nor would it alone produce the effect which we ought to require: we ought to expect some account of the relation in which these

Anglo-Saxon forms stand towards the early Germanic languages of the continent, and more especially towards the Gothic and the Old High-German, which are respectively the types of two varieties.

Of all the Germanic languages which have been preserved by the existence of a literature, or the efforts of Christian zeal, animated by faith and supported by learning, the one called Gothic or Mæsogothic is generally assumed to be the most ancient: it is in some respects also the purest. From certain very remarkable features which it possesses, it may fairly be taken as the type and earliest example of the Low-German dialects, under which very vague term is included, for the objects of the present inquiry, as much as belongs in common to the languages of Scandinavia, Iceland, England and the Scotch Lowlands, Friesland, the Netherlands, Holstein, Stormaria, Ditmarsh, the Danish isles, and much of North Germany, together with the Franks also as far as they are represented by an early literature. This common element may be said to consist in a peculiar system of consonants: and it is because the Gothic consonants appear to possess a strong likeness to those of the other languages mentioned, that it is classed with the Low-German group: for its vowels differ from those of some members of the group quite as widely as these differ among themselves in the same respect; and thus, if the vowel system alone were to be considered, we might find it necessary to include, not only the Gothic, but the Old-Norse and the Frankish under the name of high or mountain German dialects. But the vowels seem to be too variable and uncertain to allow of our making them the basis of a distinction which may be far better fixed in terms of the consonants. Besides a few records of sales, etc. and a fragment of Theodoret of Mopsueste's Commentary upon St. John's Gospel, we possess no monuments of the Gothic language except portions (happily now not inconsiderable) of Ulphilas's translation of the Bible. Some part of the sixth century is probably the utmost extent to which we can carry the antiquity of the Gothic, as we possess it.

In all probability a still more ancient form survives in what we have agreed to call Old High-Dutch or Old High-German, which differs widely in its consonants from all the languages above noticed, while in some respects its vowel relations bear a strong resemblance to those of the Gothic and even of the Old-Norse. We have indeed in this dialect no literature which claims such antiquity as must be conceded even to some Anglo-Saxon monuments: the tongue in fact is old, though the literature be young: in other words, the people yielded comparatively slower, or from various local influences did not yield at all, to those changes which learning and civilization, commerce and a necessity for extensive and rapid social intercourse are sure to produce. The first Christian missionaries to Germany were nearly contemporary with the ecclesiastical historian of England*, and long before, the earliest of our Germanic poets had sung the glory of the Almighty in strains of which an echo still

---

* Beda was born in 677. The brothers Æwald suffered martyrdom in 695, and St. Boniface in 755, nearly twenty years after Beda's death.

survives. The modern representatives of the Old High-Dutch,—which dialect, having been fixed in the minds of men by Luther's translation of the Bible, and adorned by the poems of Opitz, is now the current language of German literature, the tongue alike of Göthe and Menzel, of the poet and the critic, the schools, the pulpit and the mart,—are the descendants of the ancient Alemanni and Baiowari, the Suabians of Baden and Wirtemberg; the Bavarians, the German Austrians in the ancient March, the Swiss in their northern districts and their mountains, before the Romanic tongue offends the ear with its indefinite misty compromises, the Tyrolians, and the dwellers in the Sette and Quindeci commune near Vicenza in Italy.

A momentary digression may be pardoned in speaking of these last people. Their existence has long been known, but little besides their existence. While undisturbed in their mountains, their origin and manners might form subjects of amusing speculation, but hardly of scientific investigation. Speculation indeed was rife enough. By some, the inhabitants were looked upon as a race of wandering Germans, like gipsies seeking seats all over the world, but, unlike gipsies, retaining them when won. Again, they have been made out to be the descendants of those Cimbri and Teutones who survived the arms of Marius, although it is extremely doubtful whether there was a single drop of German blood in their whole host. Others again thought they could discern in them the Heruli whom Odoacer left behind him, or even the Ostrogoths of Thiudareikis. But they were never really known till Andreas Schmeller, some five years ago, set foot among them. He probably disbelieved all the speculations to which reference has been made, but still thought it very possible that at some early period southern Germans might have formed settlements in the north of Italy. Months might have elapsed, and the Professor's vacation ended, without his obtaining the insight he desired into the German character of these communities, for both men and women spoke, if they did not look, Italian; but fortunately one evening good beer did its work, and a guide conducting Schmeller homeward over the mountains, could not refrain in the genuine Germanism of his heart from giving a salute to the moon in pure High-Dutch of the twelfth century. The result may easily be anticipated: we now possess an excellent grammar with all its accessories, and which, with its specimens of language, songs and tales, forms no unworthy companion to the two admirable works, the 'Mundarten Baierns' and 'Baierisches Wörterbuch' of the same industrious and judicious author.

The Gothic then, and the Old High-Dutch are the two foreign elements which we shall compare: it would have been productive of advantage, had time and circumstances favoured it, to have taken more Low-Dutch dialects into consideration, and extended our comparison to the Old-Saxon, Ditmarsian and Friesic; but this would have carried us beyond the limits which must be observed in papers of this kind, and may be left for happier hours of leisure.

There is probably no language in which the whole number of sounds required is represented by separate letters: from the Sanskrit, the richest of all, to the Old-Greek or Old-Norse, the poorest in this respect, every known alphabet is inadequate to represent all the fine distinctions of sound, whether consonant or vowel. Many languages again want altogether sounds and signs which are among even the most common in cognate or derived tongues. Thus the Gothic, the earliest form of the Teutonic language, knows nothing of the short *e* and short *o*, which are of such frequent recurrence in the Anglo-Saxon. It has in fact only the three short vowels *a*, *i* and *u* (with one modification of each of the two latter, which will be explained hereafter), and in the few Greek words and proper names which could not be well avoided in a translation of the Gospels, it replaces ἐ and ὀ by the best means it could devise: thus ἐ becomes *aí*; ὀ, *aú*; for example, *Zaíbaídáiaús*, Ζεβεδαῖος, *Diabaúlaús*, Διάβολος. On the other hand, its long vowels give evidence of an acute feeling of harmony and a singular richness in that particular part of language which is most important to its euphony and its power of expression. The long vowels of the Gothic are seven in number: *ái*, *áu*, *ei*, *iú*, *é*, *ó*, and *ú*. It will be necessary to trace these ten vowels in the other Teutonic tongues, for which purpose we must assign to them their pronunciation in the Gothic itself, as the basis of our comparison: since the philologist must consider the sounds themselves, and not the signs by which sounds have accidentally been represented.

Three Short Vowels.

a, like the *a* in the New-German *band*, Ital. *trovanno*.
i, like the *i* in the English words *win*, *sin*, *thin*.[1]
u, like the *u* in the New-German *bunden*, English *bull*.

To these must be added two modified short vowels, arising under peculiar circumstances out of the vowels *i* and *u*, and used irregularly in proper names to represent ἐ and ὀ. These are

aí, like the *e* in the English words *met*, *set*, *wet*.
aú, like the *a* in the English words *flaw*, *raw*, *saw*.

Seven Long Vowels.

ái, like the English affirmative *Aye*.
áu, like the *ou* in the English words *house*, *round*, *mount*.
ei, like the *i* in the English words *wine*, *sine*, *thine*.
iú, like the *u* in the English words *refuse*, *mural*; or the *ew* in *few*.
é, like the *a* in the English words *mate*, *state*; or the *ai* in *wait*.
ó, like the *o* in the English words *rote*, *vote*, *smoke*.
ú, like the *ou* in the English word *wound*; or the *oo* in *moon*.

I believe these values to be very nearly accurate, and that they do in fact represent all the sounds which were made use of in the Gothic language. But it seems clear that other sounds and characters were found to occur in other Teutonic dialects. Two distinct principles appear to be in continual action, to whose operation we must attribute the changes which take place in the nature and form of the vowels. The first of these is a tendency in the vowel to become dulled or broken when placed in particular positions; so that a totally different sound results, and in general an indefinite or dull vowel is substituted for a fuller and more definite one. This change in some respects results from the influence of a consonant which precedes or follows the vowel; in others, from the situation of the vowel itself in the middle and especially the end of a word, where it is more liable to the effects of accent. It is very difficult to pronounce any vowel quite alike before *l*, *n*, or *r*. Even the Gothic itself replaced *i* and *u* by *aí* and *aú* whenever these vowels were followed by an *h* or an *r*; the other German dialects dropped the Gothic notation, though they in all probability retained the sound in the short *e* and *o*, which often replace *i* and *u*, even in cases where the Gothic vowels would have suffered no alteration: thus the Old High-Dutch stelan, *furari*, A.-S. stelan, represents a Gothic stilan: noman, A.-S. nomen (sometimes numen), a Gothic numans. For distinction sake, Grimm marks the *e* which grew out and represented an earlier *i* with two dots, *ë*. It seems unnecessary to adopt any peculiar designation for the *o*, because the cases in which it does not really represent *u* are very rare, being confined nearly exclusively to the Anglo-Saxon. But in the last-named dialect a still further change took place: not satisfied with transforming *i* into *ë*, before *h*, *l*, *m*, it broke the vowel into *ëo*, a sound which can only be described by pronouncing *girl* (gëorl), *puella*, in the West-country manner. Thus arose swëord, N. H.-D. schwërt, siohtra, N. H.-D. sichter: sceold, N. H.-D. schilt, etc.

Similar in character to this is the change which the Anglo-Saxon alone, of all the dialects, makes in the short *a* before *h*, *l*, *r*, and certain combinations of those consonants: it almost invariably becomes *ëa* in the true West-Saxon dialect, and is so pronounced in the south-west of England to this day: thus *cart*, *card*, *garden* (kyart, kyard, gyarden). This change at one time seemed attributable as much to the influence of a consonant preceding as of one following the vowel, and Grimm, in the new edition of his Grammar, appears to entertain a similar opinion; but upon reflection it seems necessary to relinquish this belief. It is true that the change is almost universally found when the vowel is preceded by one of the gutturals or an aspirate: thus hëard, gëard, hëal, hëarm, cëast; swëarm, wëarm, scëado: it also accompanies the palatals: thus þëarf, tëar, dëah; but the labials also are found with it: thus fëallan, fëalo, bëalo, bëard; besides in some cases it is found unpreceded by any consonant; thus ëal, ëart, ëafora, ëarfóð. The rule therefore must be made so wide, that it would cease to be a distinction at all, and the effect must therefore be confined to the consonants which succeed the vowel.

The alteration which we find in vowels at the end of a word seems to be in all respects natural and easily accounted for: it is dependent in a great degree upon the national habits, the necessity of rapid interchange of speech, altering the accentuation of words. Our forefathers spoke more slowly, more musically than we do: while we travel at from sixty to seventy miles an hour, we cannot waste time in sounding vowels, especially at the end of words: inflections and final vowels are the first sacrifices offered up to social progress and commercial activity: the Goth said sunus, *filius*; the Anglo-Saxon, sunu; the Old-English, sone: we are not satisfied with these abbreviations, but must have *son*. In the final syllable of words then we frequently find the vowel dulled into a corresponding but less definite form, till it finally perishes entirely. Thus Old-Saxon genitive fiscas, *piscis*, is the Anglo-Saxon fisces: the English has thrown away the syllable entirely. The final *i* in Gothic harjis, is the *ë* in A.-S. herë: beadu, though sometimes found, is more frequently beado: so also bealo, melo; which nevertheless recover their *u* before a vowel, and at once transform it into a consonant, thus beadwe *pugnæ*, melwes *mulsi*.

So much for the effects of position upon certain vowels. It remains to note the changes which result from the action of one vowel upon another, and which are of considerable importance in every Germanic tongue. The most striking of these is the change produced by the vowel *i* or *ë* which represents it; though from time to time both *a* and *u* may be detected in exercising a certain influence upon preceding vowels. This operation, for which we have no name, is known in Germany by that of Umlaut (*about-sound*): we must content ourselves with the very insufficient rendering "modification," which word is here confined to the expression of this peculiar action. The rule is as follows: when *a*, *u*, *ó*, *ú*, in one syllable, are followed in another by *i* or *ë*, they become in Anglo-Saxon *e*, *y*, *é*, *ý*, pronounced respectively like the *e* in *shell*, the *u* in the French word *mur*, the *a* in *bate*, and the *ee* in *steel*. Examples of this are—

Gothic.	Har-j-is,	*exercitus*,	A.-S.	her-ë.
———	Kun-i,	*genus*,	A.-S.	cyn-.
———	Wóth-is,	*dulcis*,	A.-S.	wéð-ë.
Ang.-S.	Blód,	*sanguis*,	A.-S.	bléd-an (for blódjan).
———	Fús,	*paratus*,	A.-S.	fysan (for fúsjan).

These modifications remain, even though the vowel that caused them should have perished by lapse of time: thus bed *lectus*, cyn *genus*, can only spring from an earlier beddë, cynë. Where the modifying vowel has only been introduced in the process of conjugation, and is therefore not really organic, the effect ceases on the cause being removed.

The vowels *a* and *u*, and the equivalent of the latter, viz. *o*, appear to have a power of producing a full sound in a preceding syllable, if the vowel in that syllable be an *a*: thus *a* would be found, not *æ*, in the words dagas, dagum; but *æ* would be found, not *a*, in dæges, dæge.

The Old-Norse allows *u* to exercise an influence over a preceding *a*, which it converts into *ö*, in the old notation *av*, showing its origin. Thus A.-S. lagu is the Old-Norse lög, in the Edda lavg.

Having said thus much of this very important element in the construction of the German tongues, without which, what is to follow would not be intelligible, we return to the Gothic vowels, and proceed to point out their equivalents in West-Saxon.

Goth. *a.*	A.-S. *a, e, æ, ëa, o, y.*
—— *i.*	—— *i, ë, ëo, y.*
—— *u.*	—— *u, o, y.*
—— *ái.*	—— *á, ǽ.*
—— *áu.*	—— *ëá, ý.*
—— *ei.*	—— *í.*
—— *iu.*	—— *ëó.*
—— *é.*	—— *ǽ.*
—— *ó.*	—— *ó, é.*
—— *ú.*	—— *ú, ý.*

Thus the short Gothic *a* continues to be represented in Anglo-Saxon by a similar short *a*, except in the following cases:—

1. When through modification it has become *e*.

2. When in a monosyllabic word it is followed by any one of the following consonants or combinations of consonants; viz. *c, g, h*; *p, b, f*; *t, d*; *sp*; *sc, st*; in which case it is replaced by a sharper sound, written *æ*, and pronounced like the *a* in *lad, sad, tap*. If however any of the simple consonants above-named should in the process of declension be followed by *a, o* or *u*, then the original sound and spelling return; thus mæg *filius*, dæg *dies*, stæf *baculus*, but magas, daga, stafum. The combined consonants *sp, sc, st*, are not subject to this rule, and preserve the sharper vowel without the least regard to what may follow: thus æsc *fraxinus*, æsca, not asca; blæst *flatus*, blæstum, not blastum. If instead of *a, o, u*, the vowel of the inflection should be *e*, no change takes place: thus dæg, gen. s. dæges, dat. s. dæge.

3. The third case has been noticed; viz. where *a* falls before *h, r, l*, and combinations of *r, l*: as *rd, rt, rs, ld, lt, ls*, when it is replaced by a short vowel *ëa*. Thus Goth. alls *omnis*, A.-S. ëal; Goth. waldan, A.-S. wealdan; Goth. mahts, A.-S. mëaht.

4. Where before *m* and *n* it sometimes deepens into *o*, as rom *aries*.

5. Lastly, where *ëa* itself undergoes modification, in which case a *y* or *i* makes its appearance. Thus eald *vetus*, yldesta *maximus natu*, yldan *veterasci*; mëaht *potentia*, mihtig *potens*.

I. The short *i* continues to represent the Gothic *i* in all cases except where it has become *ë* or *ëo*. Generally speaking, before the liquids *m* and *n*, the *i* remains: there is a wavering before *l*, and before *r*, *ëo* is nearly universal: so also before *h*. In other cases the *i* is tolerably constant. Examples:—Goth. niman, A.-S. niman; Goth. hliftus, A.-S. hliftan (κλέπτης, and lift, *to steal*); Goth. wiljo, A.-S. wëlan and wëolan, *divitiæ*; Goth. baírhts, A.-S.

bërht and bëorht; Goth. haírus, A.-S. hëoru, *ensis*, etc. Sometimes, but inaccurately, a short *y* is written in place of *i*; thus hyra for hira, hëora.

u. The short *u* continues to represent the Gothic *u*, in all cases where it has not been dulled into *o*, or modified by a following *i* or *ë* into *y*. Thus Goth. fulls *plenus*, A.-S. ful; Goth. sunnô *sol*, A.-S. sunne. It has been already observed that *o*=*u* may be expected in terminations: thus O. H.-D. hirutz *cervus*, A.-S. hëorot, but sometimes hëorut: heáfod, sometimes heáfud: ic hafu and ic hafo, *habeo*; ic cýðu and ic cýðo, *nuntio*. The modification regularly takes place whether the *u* or *o* be found in the root: thus Goth. kuni *gens*, A.-S. cyn for cynnë. A.-S. God *Deus*, gydën *dea*; gold *aurum*, gylden *aureus*; ful *plenus*, fyllan *implere*. This vowel *y* must have approached very nearly to the German *ü*, but with perhaps a little more tendency to the *i* sound.

ái. The long Gothic vowel *ái*, which in O. H.-D. and O.-Nor. is *ei*, and in Old-Sax. *é*, reappears in A.-S. as an *á*, which in modern English deepens into *ó*, *oa*: thus Germ. eid, eiche, A.-S. áð, ác, Eng. oath, oak. It is probable that this peculiar change is owing in general to northern influence in England: for a similar phænomenon is noticeable in the highlands of Bavaria, Austria, Tyrol, Switzerland, and other mountainous districts of Southern Germany: in these localities the natural High-Dutch *ei* is replaced by *a*, deepening not unfrequently into *ó*. Thus zwô for zwei, A.-S. twá, Eng. *two*. "A loab brot," A.-S. hláf, N. H.-D. leib brot, a *loaf* of *bread*, etc. When this long vowel *á* is followed in A.-S. by *i* or *ë*, it becomes subject to modification and takes the form of a long *ǽ*: thus hláf, *loaf*, and hláford; but hlǽfdige, *lord*, *lady*; hám, *home*; hǽman, *coire*; hǽmed, *connubium*.

áu. This long Gothic vowel reappears in O. H.-D. as *ou*, with the same sound as in Gothic; in Old-Sax. as *ó*, and in A.-Sax. as *ëá*. Thus the O. H.-D. roup *rapina*, is the A.-S. reáf: the O. H.-D. poum *arbor*, O.-Sax. bóm, is the A.-S. bëám. Its sound must have approached that of our *ee*, but still have been somewhat broader, as it is yet heard in our provinces. When followed by *i* or *ë*, this vowel was modified and became *ý*, whose pronunciation it would be nearly impossible to distinguish from that of *ee* in *deem*, *sleep*: fleám *fuga*, flýma *profugus*.

ei. The long Gothic vowel *ei*, which is always written with an *e* and *i*, and had the pronunciation of the modern Germ. *ei* in weib, or the English *i* in wife, was in all the Teutonic dialects replaced by a long *í*, having the sound of *ee* in weep. In most parts of Germany and in England this vowel has returned to the Old-Gothic pronunciation: thus *wine*, *wife*.

iu. In the West-Saxon dialect, the long Gothic vowel *iu* was represented by *eó*: thus Goth. liusa, A.-S. leósan; Goth. griuta, A.-S. greótan. In O. H.-D. it remained for the most part unchanged, though some writers replace it by *io*, *ia*, and even *ie*. It is the N. H.-D. *eu* (pronounced *oi*), while in English it is pronounced *ee*, though written sometimes with an *ie*, sometimes with *ee*, as in thief, deep, A.-S. ðëóf, dëóp. The Old-Saxon form is *ia*, the Old-Norse *ió*; the dialect of Kent has *iu, io, ia*, and *ie*, thus running from one end of the scale to the other. This vowel is sometimes erroneously replaced by *ý*.

é. This Gothic vowel remains unchanged in West-Saxon, but with a different notation, viz. *æ′*. Thus Goth. dêds, A.-S. dǽd *facinus*, O. H.-D. and O.-S. *á*; thus tất, dâd. In modern English it has become nearly universally *ee*, thus deed.

ó. The Gothic long *ó* is represented in O. H.-D. by *uo*, in O.-S. and A.-S. by *ó*; thus Goth. môds *animus*, O. H.-D. muot, O.-S. and A.-S. mód. A following *i* or *ë* converts this in A.-S. into *é*: thus dóm *doom*; déman, to *doom* or *deem*.

ú. The Gothic long *u* is replaced in A.-S. by *u*, except in the one case of modification by *i* or *ë*, when it becomes *ý*; thus rúms *amplus*, A.-S. rúm; but rýman *dilatare*, rýmet *dilatatio*.

Having thus established a regular system of A.-S. equivalents, and settled the relation of the usual A.-S. vowels to those of the other Teutonic dialects, we can proceed to point out wherein the Northumbrian order differs from the rest, and in what respects it holds a middle place between the older and the later forms. In general it will be found to have affected broad, rough sounds, and consequently not to display those numerous changes in which the dialect of Wessex above all others abounds. We shall take the vowels in the same order as before.

a. 1. The modification of *a* into *e* for the most part continues.

2. *a* is still changed into *æ* in the cases for which the rule was laid down; and with the same exceptions: thus dæg *dies*; dagum *diebus*; dæge *diei*. But it is a peculiarity of this dialect to replace the *æ* itself by *e*: thus weter *aqua*; deg *dies*; wes *fui*; feder, fedrum, *pater, patribus*; megne *virtutes*; ber *tuli*. To this there is no parallel in pure A.-S. manuscripts, except perhaps in the dialect of Kent.

3. In those cases where the West-Saxon dialect has *ëa*, the Northumbrian for the most part leaves the vowel unchanged; thus before *l, r* and their combinations it usually retains *a*. Examples:—ald *vetus*; sald *dedi*; walde *voluit*; halda *tenere*; walda *regere*; bald *audax*; al *totus*; ðarf *necessitas*; aron *estis*; siofenfald *septuplex*; galla *fel*; gewald *potentia*; galgre *patibulum*; arð *es*. This is so constant as to be one of the surest characteristics of the dialect. In a few cases only, and by way of exception, we find ðu ëart, *es*; middangeard, *orbis terrarum*; but *ëa* does not appear to be found before *l* or its combinations.

4. It necessarily follows that *y*, which arises from the modification of *ëa*, must be extremely rare. It is usually replaced by *æ*: thus ældo *seniores*, Durh. Matt. xxi. v. 23.

II. In the Northumbrian dialect, the short *i* has not yielded to *ë*, to anything like the same degree as in Wessex. This peculiarity, which is perhaps attributable to period quite as much as to locality, is found also in Kent, before the end of the ninth century. Examples: bi for the usual bë; bihalda *conspicere*; biform *ante*; bilúcan *claudere*:

gi for the usual gë; gihuaes for gehwǽs; mæcti for mæhte; éci for écë; drictin for dryhten; ǽrist; giwundad; gistóddun; mic for mëc (acc. s. of pronoun); witgan, witgena for witan, wëotan; hifun for hëofen, *cælum*; birhtu for bëorhtu, byrhtu *splendor*; niðerlíc for nëoðerlíc, *imus*. Still no doubt we find numerous instances where the *ë* has replaced *i*: such are wërc *opus*; weolerum *labiis*; hëofen *cælum*, etc. In a majority of cases however where the West-Saxon dialect would have required *ëo*, and especially before the liquid *r* and its combinations, the Northumbrian affects the sharper sound of *ëa*: thus fëarran, ëarðe, hëarras *cardines*, heara, hearta *cordium*; forgëafa *ignosci*; sëalla *dare*. Of this peculiarity we find traces in the contemporary dialect of Kent: thus wiarald *mundus*; wiada *sylvæ*; Osbëarhte, Osberto; agiaban *rependere*. This may be looked upon as one of the strong characteristics of Angle dialect. But the most remarkable peculiarity which we have noticed respecting the short *i*, is the substitution of *a*, *e* or *æ* for it, and in cases where a pure liquid following might have been expected to preserve its sound in purity. Thus, wælle *voluerit*, D. Mat. xx. 27; huæt wallað gie, *quid vultis?* D. Mat. xx. 32; cuoeða wælla *dixerit*, D. Mat. xxi. 3; færmo *nuptiæ* (usually fëorm), D. Mat. xxii. 2, 3, 4; wælla suoeriga *juraverit*, D. Mat. xxiii. 16, 18; wærco for wëorca, D. Mat. xxiv. 8; hwærflung from hwëorfan, D. Mat. xxiv. 24; hwælc, D. Mat. xxiv. 44. This seems to be a nearer approach to the Gothic practice than that of the common West-Saxon; a remark which will have to be extended to some other peculiarities. With a singular perversity, this dialect selects the verb niman and its parts to exemplify a change which is extremely rare in all the rest, and it nearly always has nïoman for niman *to take*.

u. The only point in which the Northumbrian differs from the West-Saxon in the use of this vowel, is in the comparative rarity of its replacing it by *o*. Thus it retains it in the terminations of verbs and nouns: cwomun, arun, wëaruld, fiódun *oderunt*, somud *und*, âtur *venenum*, fædur *pater*, birhtu, fyrhtu, dióful, we earun numene, wëotudlíce, wuldur *gloria*, etc. etc. The modification of *u* into *y* continues: thus fylde *replevit*; kyningk *rex*. One remarkable exception is found in the preposition ðorh, usually ðurh, in which form the Northumbrian monuments rarely if ever apply it. But this exception is probably merely apparent and has no real foundation in fact. The Gothic differs in this respect from the Old High-Dutch and Anglo-Saxon, that it forms the preposition thaírh, not thaúrh, i. e. with an *i*, not a *u*. But the Northumbrian uses ðërh quite as frequently as ðorh, perhaps even more frequently, and it may therefore be supposed that even the ðorh itself was rather intended to represent *i* than *u*.

ái. The long vowel *á* which represents the Goth. *ái*, remains in the Northumbrian, but probably had a deep tone, verging upon *ó*. Thus gást *spiritus*, hál *sanus*, hát *calidus*. The modification is also unchanged: hǽtu *calor*, hǽlu *salus*; clǽne *parvus*, unclǽnsia *inquinare*, etc. Generally the notation is separate, *a* and *e*, not *ǽ*.

ei. The usual long *í* remains unchanged.

iu. In Northumberland, as well as in Kent, this vowel is subject to considerable change. We may be sure that it was originally *iu*, for the Kentish tradition asserts that Hengist and his comrades came over in three *chiulæ*, i. e. West-Saxon ceól, Eng. keel. A Kentish coin of the ninth century still has Ciulnoð; yet at the same period we find Ciálnoð, in Wessex Ceólnoð; friándum *amicis*; hiá *illa*; bebiáde *jubeo*; geþián *proficere*; bián *esse*; and in Northumbrian we have a large number of examples, of which the following are specimens: gecëása *captari*; gesëá *videre*; nëásade *visitavit*; gefrëáde *liberavit*. We have also *ie*, as in onsiene *faciem*; and even a plain *é*: thus léht *lux*, Rit. 2, 4, 5; galgatré *patibulum*, Rit. 23; and légað *mentientur*, Psalt. 200. At the same time the common West-Saxon *ëó* makes its appearance frequently in the same monuments.

é. The Gothic long *é* continues to be represented in the Northumbrian, sometimes by the usual *æ'*, sometimes by *é*; but as this is merely a mode of notation which involves no difference of sound, it requires no notice.

ó. The Gothic long *ó* still remains as *ó*. The modification however of *ó*, viz. *é*, is subject to a different notation in Northumbrian. In the oldest monuments of all, we find *ói*: thus Coinraed, usually Cénred, Cóinwalh for Cénwalh, Cóifi or Cóifig, thē *ardent*, from Cóf. At a later period, both in Kent and Northumberland, we have not *é*, but *óe*, which like the *ói* shows clearly the real origin of the vowel. Examples are, bóenum *precibus*; dóema *judicare*; fóeda *pasci*.

ú. The long *u*, and its modification *ý*, are the same as in the other dialects, and require no further notice than this: that in D. Mat. xxvii. we find the resolved form *úe* (i. e. *uë*) instead of *ý*, giving evidence of the origin of this vowel.

áu. The long Gothic *áu*, as has been observed, answers to a West-Saxon *eá*. This is retained in the Northumbrian, as well as the modification into *ý*. But frequently a long *é* is substituted for it, which sometimes, but very rarely, occurs south of the Humber. Its recurrence in the Northumbrian is so common as to make it characteristic of this dialect. Thus geléfa *fides* for gelëáfa, and even geléfu *credo* (where the modification would require gelýfu); béh, bég *torques*; héh *altus*; ëó *facilis*. A still more remarkable peculiarity however of the Northumbrian is the substitution of *ëó* for *ëá* or *é*: thus dëóð for dëáð; ëóre for ëáre *auris*; ëóstorlíc for ëásterlíc *paschalis*.

So much for the vowels. It may facilitate comparison if we exhibit them in a tabular form. In the following scheme the vowels are arranged according to the powers of the Gothic, which occupies the first column; the second contains the usual Old High-Dutch forms; the third, the forms current in Wessex; the last, those of Northumberland.

GOTHIC.	O. H.-D.	WEST-SAXON.	NORĐ.
A.	a, e.	a, e, æ, ëa, o, y.	a, e, o, æ.
I, aí.	i, ë.	i, ë, ëo, y.	i, ë, ëa, æ, ëo.
U, aú.	u, o.	u, o, y.	u, o, y.
A'I.	ei, ai.	á, ǽ.	á, ǽ.
A'U.	ou, ó.	ëá, ý.	ëá, é, ý, eo.
EI.	í.	í.	í.
IU.	iá, ie, iu.	ëó, ý.	ëó, ió, ëá, iá, ié, ý, é.
E'.	á, ǽ.	ǽ.	ǽ, é.
O'.	uo.	ó, é.	ó, ói, óe.
U'.	au.	ú, ý.	ú, ý.

On a future occasion we shall point out some characteristic peculiarities in the use of the Consonants, which occasionally differ very much from the ordinary West-Saxon, especially in the order of Gutturals and Dentals.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Vol. II. JUNE 27, 1845. No. 37.

Professor Twiss in the Chair.

A paper was read—

"On the relations which exist between the preterite *went* and the verb *go*; and also between *va*, and the verbs *aller* and *andare*." By Professor Key.

It was contended, in a paper formerly read before the Society, that *better* was the real comparative of *good*; and attention was called to the many cases where a deficiency of forms from one root was *said* to be supplied with the required forms from another independent root. Among the instances there enumerated occurred the words *go* and *went* of our own tongue, and *va* and *aller* of the French. The object of the present paper is to show that the irregularities in these four words are to be explained by the mere interchange of letters, and not by the doctrine of conplementary roots.

It is commonly admitted that the Italian *andare* and the French *aller* are correlatives in form as well as in meaning. The interchange of *d* or *nd* with *l* has often been noticed, and is very characteristic of the language from which the Italian and French are derived, as is seen in *caleo* and *cando*, whence *candela, candidus, incendo*, etc.; *scando* and *scala*; *mando* and *mala*; *pando* and *palam*; *sedeo* and *sella*; *rado* and *ralla*. It is also seen in the English substantive *wall*, by the side of the German equivalent *wand*, and in the German *stellen*, the factitive form of *stehen, stand*.

The identity moreover of *andare* and *aller* is strongly confirmed by their similar position in the two tenses of the Italian and French languages, viz. *vado* or *vo, vai, va*; *andiamo, andate, vanno*; and *vais, vas, va*; *allons, allez, vont*. But if they be allied, the question still remains, from what Latin word are they derived? The answer is from *vado* itself; from which, beyond all doubt, the other persons of these tenses have proceeded. The double form of the first person in Italian is an answer to the only difficulty which could present itself in the disappearance of the *d*; and there exists an instance of the same change which is perfectly parallel in the double form of the great river of northern Italy, *Pado* and *Po*. But let us examine *vado* more accurately. It is a common accident of the Latin verb to have two forms, one ending in a single consonant, the other inserting a nasal in addition. *Tang-o*, for example, appears in the old writers as *tag-o*, whence *integer*, etc. Thus Terence has *ne me attigas*, and Gellius quotes *Pellex asam ne tagito*. So again *tundo* forms a perfect *tutudi* and a participle indifferently, *tunsum* or *tusum*; and *fundo* has a perfect *fudi*. The same modification of the consonants is exhibited in *unda* and *udus*, and in the Greek ἁνδανω and ἁδυς; and nearly in the same relative position stand *pando* and *pateo*. Hence among the many dialects which must have existed in ancient Italy, *vandere* would probably have been found somewhere as an equivalent of *vādere*. Secondly, the initial *v* of *vadere*, or rather *w* if we look to the pronunciation, is precisely the letter of all others most apt to disappear from the beginning of words. Of this principle, the very words *ἀνδανω* and *ἅδυς*, which have been just quoted, are examples, for it is well-known that they were once written with the digamma, Ϝ*ανδανω* and Ϝ*αδυς*. Nay, the other words *unda* and *udus* are commonly held to be the Latin equivalents of our Saxon *water* and *wet*. We have another example of such a disappearance of an initial *w* in the name of the *Vandals*, who migrating through Spain into Africa, left their name indelibly impressed on the map of the Peninsula in the title *Andal-usia*. That such was the origin of the name of that province is a fact historically known, and indeed the Arabic appellation for the whole Peninsula is to this day *Wandaluz*. Again, the Greek verb *αω*, *to breathe*, had for its full root the syllable Ϝ*αν*, connected with which are the Greek *ανεμος*, and both of the Latin words *animus* and *ventus*.

There still remains one difficulty. The Italian *andare* would have corresponded more accurately with a Latin verb of the first or *a* conjugation. This is a difficulty which may be satisfactorily explained. As the great mass of *secondary* verbs in the Latin language happened to belong to the first conjugation, there was a general tendency in the mouth of the Romans to draw all verbs into that form. In this way we may account for the irregularity of such verbs as *sonare*, *tonare*, etc., in making perfects and participles in *ui* and *itum*. These terminations denote an original verb which was not of the first conjugation, and in fact we find in the oldest writers *sonĕre*, *tonimus*, etc. In the same way the substantives *spirĭtus* and *halĭtus* afford evidence that there once existed the infinitives *spirĕre* and *halĕre*, which were afterwards supplanted by *spirare* and *halare*. These considerations put together render it perhaps not improbable that *vād* is the parent of *andare* and *aller*. But there still remains another Latin verb which seems to claim kindred with those of which we have been treating, viz. *ambulare*.

The meaning given to *ambulare* presents no difficulty, for even in our own language we find the verb *go* frequently used in the sense of *to walk* by the older English writers, as Chaucer in the 'Frere's Tale':

> "Somtime like a man or like an ape,
> Or like an angel can I ride or go."

(vide Johns. Dict.) But the peculiar form of *ambulare* requires more careful consideration. The Latin and Greek, like the Teutonic dialects, abound in verbs of a secondary character, which affix to the simple root a syllable containing one of the liquids, more commonly *r*, *l* or *n* than *m*. Examples in our own tongue are *waver*, *slumber*, *flatter*, etc.; *suckle*, *ruffle*, *grumble*; *open*, *hasten*, *reckon*. In the Greek tongue it will be sufficient to refer to *μανθανω*, *λιμπανω*, *φυγγανω*, and in the Latin to *generare*, *strangulare*, *suffarcinare*, *postulare*. It may be a question how far these secondary verbs are formed from intermediate substantives, and also how far they partake of a diminutive power, but these are not matters for discussion on the present occasion. That *ambulare*, with the consonants *mb*, might be formed from such a primitive as *andare* or *andere*, will perhaps be admitted by those who compare the Latin *lumbi* with its German equivalent *lende*, the Latin *tundo* with its Greek and English representatives τυπτω and *thump*, the Latin *scando** with the English *climb* and *clamber*, the Latin *mando* with the English *mumble* and the German substantive *mund*, the Latin *vent-er* with the English *womb*; or by those who compare the several forms of our own *round*, *roll*, and *rumble*;—*growl*, *groan* (Fr. *grondir*), and *grumble*;—or the English *lime-tree* with the German *linden*.

Before leaving the languages of France and Italy, it may be as well to observe that the preservation of the *v* in the singular and the third person plural of the verbs *andare* and *aller* is probably due to the brevity of the forms *vo*, *vai*, etc., compared with *andiamo*, *andate*, etc.

Proceeding to the northward we find in our tongue the verb *go*, which in signification is the precise equivalent of the words we have been examining; but there is *primâ facie* no similarity of form. This consideration should not be held to be at once fatal to the possibility of a connection between them. Who, without a full examination, would have assented to the identity of *talis* and *such*; *qualis* and *which*; *aut* and *or*; *hi* and *they*; *ille* and *yon*; *ego* and *I*; *quinque* and *five*; *duodecim* and *twelve*; *centum* and *hundred*; *oculus* and *eye*; *caput* and *head*, etc.? and yet all these pairs of words may be shown to be exact equivalents of each other. Indeed the whole Saxon basis of our language differs from the Latin tongue, solely as one dialect differs from another.

As regards the word *go*, the difference even at first view from *andare* is scarcely greater than that of the Italian *vo*; or rather, we may say, *va*, for the *o* in *vo* is the exclusive property of the first person. But be the difference ever so great, it is precisely among the primitive words of a language that apparent anomalies and violent changes occur; and that *go* belongs to the early verbs of our own tongue is established, partly by the perfect participle, ending as it does in *n*—*gone*, but still more by the present indicative in the Old High-German *gam*, *gas*, *gàt*, etc. (Grimm, i. 868), where we have one of the few examples of the first person retaining the suffix *m*. But we must examine the various forms of the verb before us. The Scotch *gang*, confirmed as it is by our substantives *gangway* and *press-gang*, and by the German participle *ge-gang-en*, presents us with the vowel required, and that vowel followed by a nasal sound. We should have preferred *nd* or *mb* to *ng*, but the three sounds are not unfrequently interchanged. Thus the German termination of the imperfect participle is *end*, but the English *ing*,—*habend*, *having*. Again, the English *hunger* bears a strong resemblance to the Spanish *hambre*, formed from the middle-aged Latin *famina*. So again the Latin

---

* The insertion or loss of an *l* is seen in the Latin *sop-or*, *somp-nus*, beside the English *sleep* and German *schlaf*; in the Latin *fugére*, beside the English *fly* and the German *fliegen* and *flug*; in the Latin *cludo* beside the English *shut*, etc.

lambere is connected with the French *langue* and Latin *lingua*, and therefore with the English *tongue*. We must not avail ourselves of such-degradations as in the Latin *cambiare* and French *changer*, etc., because the *ng* in *changer* or *change* has a sound widely different from that of *gang*. That our English verb should begin with a *g*, when the Latin has a *v*, is in no way surprising, especially when the vowel *o* follows. The connection between *good* and *well* is a parallel case, and in the attempt in a former paper to establish this connection, it was shown that while the guttural *g* preferred the neighbourhood of *a*, *o*, or *u*, the appearance of an *e* in the root generally led to the introduction of a preceding lip-letter. The perfect tense *went*, as compared with *go*, is another example of this change, and indeed the present *wend* is also used in the same sense of *going*, and there seems strong reason for believing that *wend* and *gang* are only dialectic variations of the same word, as *ward*, *guard*; *wise*, *guise*, etc.

The word *walk* deserves a few words. Our etymologists are not happy in dealing with this verb. A comparison with *hark* and *talk* will probably throw light upon it. Now *hark* is evidently a secondary formation from *hear*, corresponding to the German *hörchen*, and not less certain is it that *talk* stands in the same relation to *tell*. Hence the final letter of *walk* is no portion of the root. We are thus reduced to the syllable *wal*. Now this form of the root exists in the German, as in the substantive *waller*, a rambler; in the compound *wall-fahrt*, pilgrimage, and even in the verb *wallen*. But in considering this verb care is required, as the lexicographers have placed under one root, translations which belong to several. We speak on the present occasion of the verb *wallen*, as used in the Psalms, 42, 5: "*Schon wall' ich auf der Bahn die uns zu Ehre leitet.*" When the same word signifies to 'bubble' or 'boil,' it is a root altogether independent of that we are discussing, and belongs to the same family as the Latin *unda*, the German *welle*, etc. The English words *walk*, *walker*, in the sense of *fulling*, *fuller*, belong probably to a third root, and therefore need not be considered here.

In the German tongue our root has produced two secondary verbs *wandern* and *wandeln*, the latter of which has the same suffix as the Latin *ambulare*, and precisely the same meaning; while the form *wandern*, in its sense of 'to travel,' differs not very widely from our own verb *wander*, which is evidently a secondary verb, like *clamber*, *wonder*, etc. Probably *wandeln* and *wandern* themselves are merely dialectic varieties of each other, for it is not a rare thing for the same word to appear twice in a language, with a slight variety of form and meaning: see Grimm, ii. 119, where he speaks of these very words. If this be the case, there is nothing to surprise us in finding *vandre* and *vandra* in the Danish and Swedish with the very signification *to walk*.

Attention has been already drawn to the fact that the English noun *wall* is in German *wand*. Hence it was to be expected that the verb *wall*, as seen in the diminutive *walk*, would enter the German tongue as *wand* in *wandeln* and *wandern*.

The ordinary doctrine, that our perfect *went* is borrowed from a verb *wend*, signifying 'to turn,' has a difficulty to contend with in the *signification* itself. No doubt the German verb *wenden* means to 'turn,' but it belongs to a root wholly different, viz: to the same family as our verb *wind* and the Greek Ϝειλεω. The verb *wend* in the sense of *go* is actually used in English, and bears the very closest resemblance to the radical syllable of *wandeln*, etc. The same change in fact has occurred in a word which has been already adduced, viz. *Vandals*, for these people, though held in subjection by German masters, were themselves probably in race no other than the Wends of the present day. Compare also *Elbe, Albis*; *Ems, Amisia*; *Hesse, Catti*, etc. Another argument in favour of the identity of the roots *go* and *wend* is found in the fact that *wend*, like *go*, sometimes signifies 'to walk.' Thus Chaucer in the Prioresses Tale:

> "And thurgh the strete men mighten ride and wende,
> For it was free and open at either ende."

Lastly, it may be advantageous to compare what we have found in the Teutonic dialects with the forms which occur in the Latin and its derived tongues. In the north we insist on a prefixed guttural or digamma; in the south this initial consonant is dispensed with, except in the form *vadere*. The vowel *a* appears in all the forms except in our own *wend* and *went*. And as regards the final consonants, there is not a trifling parallelism between the *all-er* and *anda-re* of France and Italy compared with the German *wall-en*, and *wandeln* or *wandern**.

---

* The Greek βαινω has βαν for its radical syllable, and is probably the correlative of the words in discussion. The Neapolitan dialect strikes out every *d* which follows an *n*, and thus gives us *anare* for *andare*. And the initial β is a fair representative of *v* in *vado*. We may observe too, that the final consonants disappear alike in the Italian *va*, in the Greek root, which so often appears as βα alone, and in our English *go* or *ga*.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. NOVEMBER 28, 1845. No. 38.

Professor WILSON, V. P., in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table:—

Two MS. Lists of Provincialisms; one presented by the Rev. Dr. Williamson, the other by Dr. Roots of Kingston. "Winer's Grammar of the Chaldee Language," translated by H. B. Hackett, Andover, U. S.; presented by the Rev. Dr. Davies. "Rimes Guerneseaises par un Câtelan," Guernsey, 1831; presented by Professor Graves.

A paper was then read:—

"On the Anomalous Verbs of the English Language." By Edwin Guest, Esq.

Our grammarians, for the most part, consider as anomalous the verbs which form their past participles in *n*. In this light they were viewed by Hickes; but the arrangement was objected to by Ten Kate, and the scheme, of which the Dutch grammarian first drew the outline, has (with more or less of modification) been generally adopted by continental philologists. Ten Kate appropriated three of his six divisions to those verbs whose participles end in *n*, and his sixth or last he assigned to certain verbs, which deviated so widely from the ordinary conjugations, as to merit, in an especial manner, the title of anomalous. The peculiarities of these verbs, so far as they have been developed in English syntax, it is proposed to examine in the following paper.

There seems to be no one characteristic which runs through the whole of this class of verbs; but they are distinguished by a tendency to adopt certain forms which it may be well to place clearly before the reader, before we investigate the conjugation of any verb in particular.

In the first place, the present tense often takes (in part or wholly) the same inflexions and the same change of the radical vowel as the perfect of those verbs which form their past participles in *n*. The peculiar nature of these inflexions will be seen at once by comparing together the present and past tenses of the verb *to come*, as they appear in our Old-English MSS.

	Present Tense.	Past Tense.
Sing.	come	cam.
	comst	cume.
	comþ	cam.
Plur.	comeþ or come	cumen or cume.

The second person singular of the past tense sometimes takes *st* instead of the vowel inflexion, even in the Anglo-Saxon; and the substitution becomes proportionably more frequent as we approach our modern dialect; we are therefore quite prepared to find our anomalous verbs taking such forms as *canst, darst, wost,* &c. The change of the radical vowel may be traced as late as the fifteenth century: sing *can, dar, shal,* &c.; plur. *cunne, durre, shulle,* &c.

Another peculiarity of these verbs is a tendency to adopt *t* as the inflexion of the second person singular*: *ar-t, wer-t, is-t, was-t, migh-t, wil-t,* &c. The distinction between the inflexions *t* and *st* is probably one of mere letter-change, but it is deeply rooted in the antiquity of our language, and forms an important landmark in some of the more obscure paths of philological research.

The preterites of our anomalous verbs generally resemble the preterites of those verbs which form their past participle in *d*:—sing. *shulde, shuldest, shulde,* plur. *shulden* or *shulde*; but *was,* the preterite of the verb substantive, resembles *cam* both in its form and its inflexions. The formation of the preterite depends on laws which vary with the different verbs, and in some cases on laws of letter-change which are both obscure and difficult of investigation. As however no deduction is here drawn from these laws, and they are referred to solely for the purposes of classification, the mere enunciation of them, without any formal proof, may perhaps be considered as sufficient.

As we trace our language downwards from the Anglo-Saxon, we find these anomalous verbs more and more assimilating themselves to our ordinary conjugations—to the northern conjugations in the north, and to the southern conjugations in the south of England. According to the usage which prevailed in our northern counties, a verb was often used without inflexion or change of structure in both numbers and in all the persons. Hence in some early northern MSS. we find the anomalous verbs stripped of all their peculiarities, and not even taking an inflexion in the second person singular.

The singular of the verb substantive has in all the changes of our language preserved nearly the same forms, *am, art, is*; the later plural, *aren* or *are,* was borrowed from our northern dialect, the form which preceded it in the Anglo-Saxon having disappeared at the time when our language melted into the Old-English. According to modern philology both singular and plural forms consist of the root *is* combined with certain verbal endings, and acted upon by letter-changes, the history of which has been hitherto only partially investigated. It may be sufficient at present to observe, that the change of the *s* into *r* between two vowels, as in *aren,* is a very marked feature of the Anglo-Saxon. We may have occasion hereafter to refer to it.

The root *is* is found in all the Indo-European languages, and in some of them is used as a verb in an uncompounded state and without any change of structure. In Irish it enters into construction

---

* In the Icelandic, with some few exceptions, the verbs which usually form their past participle in *n* take this inflexion in the second person singular of their preterite; *brenna,* to burn, is inflected in that tense, as follows: sing. *brann, brannt, brann*; plur. *brunnum,* &c.

with all the personal pronouns: *is me, is tu, is e, is sian, is sibh, is iad*; I am, thou art, he is, we are, &c.; and in some of our northern dialects it appears to have been used with equal freedom.

1. Now may I say that *I is* but an ape.—Ch. Reves Tale, 282.

2. Our manciple I hope he wol be ded
Swa workes ay the wanges in his hed,
And therefore *is I* come and eke Aleyn.—Ch. Reves Tale, 111.

3. With alle dayntethis on dese, thi dietis ar diȝte,
And *I* in dungun and dill *is* done for to duelle.
Antur of Arthur at the T. W. 15.

4. *I is* made a pursuivant against my will.—B. Jons. T. of a Tub, 2. 1.

5. I kna not what to dea—*Is'e* laath to leav the barns.—Wheeler's First Westm. Dial.

6. *Ise* reet fain, *Ise* cum this hefter-nean, etc.—Wheeler's Westm. Dial.

7. — þou ert comen fro ferne & riche kyng *is* of fe. R. Br. 193.

8. Myn heritage I crave of þe that *is* my heued. R. Br. 90.

9. Now Symond, said this John, by Saint Cuthberd
Ay *is thou* mery, and that is faire answerd.
Ch. Reves Tale, 200.

10. He was a wight of high renoune,
And *thou'se* but of a low degree. Old Ballad, Percy.

11. Siker *thou's* but a lazy lad. Spens. July.

12. The teeth of time may gnaw Tantallan,
But *thou's* for ever. Burns on Pastoral Poetry.

13. Scotland and me*'s* in great affliction.—Burns's Earnest Cry, &c.

14. I is as ill a miller as *is ye**. Ch. Reves Tale, 125.

15. Wille Gris! Wille Gris!
Thincke twat (qwat) you was and qwat *you is*.
Chron. de Lanercost, p. 52.

16. — three parts of him
Is ours already. Jul. Cæsar, 1. 3.

17. All things *is* ready, how near is our master?
T. of the Shrew, 4. 1.

18. Marcy on us! times *is* fearfully awtered sen I war a young woman, &c.—Wheeler's First Westm. Dial.

19. — our nebbors *is* sic a spiteful gang.
Wheeler's Westm. Dial.

This use of the verb *is* may either have originated in that confusion of forms which often distinguishes a mixed and broken dialect, or it may be a remnant of an earlier and simpler grammar than our literature has handed down to us. That *is* was considered as a verbal *root* long after the forms *am, art, are* were elaborated, appears from the fact that it gave birth to another form of the second person —*ist*, which is clearly identical with the Old-Swedish *æst* (Petersen's Hist. p. 207).

---

* The reader need hardly be reminded, that the passages quoted from Chaucer, ex. 1, 2, 14, are imitations of our northern dialect.

20. I see thou*st* an arrant maislykin an net fit tae gang frae heaam.—Wheeler's First Westm. Dial.

As this form *ist* in all probability originated before our dialects were broken up, the second of the above hypotheses seems to be the preferable one.

As late as the fifteenth century, *was* took inflections similar to those of *cam*: sing. *was, were, was*; plur. *weren* or *were*; the *s* being changed into *r* between the two vowels, according to the law already noticed:—

21. And when Peter *was* in the halle bynethe, oon of the dameseles of the higheste preste cam &c, & seide, "and *thou were* with Ihesus of Nazareth."—Wiclif, Mark 14.

22. And I wepte myche, for noon *was* foundun worthi to opene the book &c. And thei sungen a newe song & seiden lord oure god thou art worthi to take the book and to opene the seelis of it, for *thou were* slain, &c.—Wiclif, Apocalyps, 5.

23. O Sathan envious sin thilke day
That *thou were* chased from our heritage,
Wel knowest thou to woman the olde way.
Ch. M. of Lawes Tale, 256.

24. Thorwe my sinne man *was* forlorn,
And man to save *thou wore* alle torn,
And of a mayd in Bedleem born. Cov. Myst. 344.

The Norse dialects change *s* to *r** even in the singular; thus the Danish has, sing. *var*, plur. *vare*. Similar forms were used in the north of England.

25. *War naw theaw* here tother dey bob yesterday wi' the dog prethee?—*I war* sur.—Collier's Tim Bobbin, 6.

26. *I war* gangin tea th' mill, and watter *war* out, &c.—Wheeler's Westm. Dial.

This letter-change was not unknown even in our southern counties; thus in Dorsetshire the scheme of inflexion is as follows: sing. *wer, werst, wer*, plur. *wer* (Barnes, Diss. p. 27); and the same forms seem to have prevailed in Somersetshire, though *werst* has not been met with in any specimen of that dialect.

27. My father's cot *war* desolate,
An âll look'd wild verlorn,
The ash *war* stunted that *war* set
The dâ that *I war* born. Jennings, The Rookery.

South of the Parret the following inflexions are used: sing. *was, wart, was*; plur. *were*.

28. —*t'was* thee roil'st upon me up to Doraty Vrogwills upzitting, whan tha vangst (and be hanged to tha!) to Rabbin—shou'd zeem *tha wart* zeek arter me-at and me-al, &c.—Exmoor Scolding, 1.

---

* The laws which regulated the change of *s* to *r* were much the same in Latin as in the Gothic. Thus the change is frequent in Latin when the consonant occurs between two vowels, *genus, generis*, &c., and occasionally takes place even when the *s* is final, as *honor, labor, arbor*, &c. for *honos, labos, arbos*, &c.

29. Dest'nt remember, whan tha comst over tha clam, wi the old Hugh Hosegood, whan tha wawter *was* by stave, how tha velt in and the old Hugh drade thee out, &c., whan *tha wart* just a buddled.—Exmoor Scolding, 1.

30. Is' did'n think *thee wart* so zoon a galled.—Dev. Dial. 1, Palmer's ed.

Wert was occasionally used even by our classical writers (vid. Johns. Dict.). The modern term *wast* worked its way into our written language during the fifteenth century. It is formed from *was* in the same way as *ist* (ex. 20) from *is*. *Wert* in its formation runs parallel to *art*.

The verbs *can* (to be able), *an* (to give), and *man* or *mun* (to be obliged) closely resemble each other in their inflexions, and also in the formation of their perfect. The following scheme exhibits their present and past tenses, as they appear in our Anglo-Saxon MSS., and also the past tense of *ongynnan*, to begin :—

	Present Tense.				Past Tense.
Sing.	can	an	ge-man.	*Sing.*	on-gan.
	cunne	unne	ge-manst.		on-gunne.
	can	an	ge-man.		on-gan.
Plur.	cunnon	unnon	ge-munnon.	*Plur.*	on-gunnon.

	Past Tense.		
Sing.	cuþe	uþe	ge-munde.
	cuþest	uþest	ge-mundest.
	cuþe	uþe	ge-munde.
Plur.	cuþon	uþon	ge-mundon.

Here we have the inflexions of the present tenses *can, an, ge-man*, agreeing in every particular with those of the past tense *ongan*, save that *ge-man* forms its second person in *st*. This need not surprise us, when we remember that the Anglo-Saxon occasionally uses *st* in the second person of the past tense. Indeed we often find *canst* used instead of *cunne* in our Anglo-Saxon MSS.

The formation of the past tenses *cuþe, uþe, gemunde*, seems to be peculiar. The final syllable has probably nothing in common with the affix *de*, which forms so many of our English preterites. There are reasons for believing that it represents the *n* of the present tenses *can, an, geman*; and that *n, nd*, and þ are merely different modifications of the same literal element. But we have space neither to examine these reasons, nor to discuss the still more important question which relates to the final vowel in *cuþe, uþe, gemunde*.

The primary meaning of *can* is 'to know'; the secondary meaning, 'to be able.' The link which connects the two is obvious. The following is the Old-English conjugation: pres. sing. *can, canst, can*, plur. *cunnen* or *cunne*; perf. *couþe* or *coude*; inf. *to cunne*, part. *couth*.

31. I *can* no more expound in this matere
I lerne song, *I can* but smal grammere. Ch. Prioresses Tale, 83.

32. He seide to the tribune, wher it is leeful to me, to speke any thing to thee? & he seide *canst thou* Greek?—Wiclif, Deedis, 21.

33. —telle þam mot no man
Bot he þat alle wote, and alle þing ses and *can*. R. Br. 218.

34. — *ye cunnen* deme the face of hevenes, but
Ye moun not wite the tokenes of men. Wiclif, Matt. 16.

35. Lewede men *cunne* French non
Among an hondryd unnethis on. R. C. de Lion, 26.

36. *Couthest þou* wissen ous þe way. woder out Treuthe wonyeth.
Vis. de P. Pl. pass. 8.

37. *Thei couthe* much, *he couthe* more.—Gower, Conf. Am. 6. Ulisses.

38. His felow taught him homeward prively
Fro day to day til *he coude* it by rote.—Ch. Prioresses Tale, 93.

39. Allas said Richard that ever it suld be *kuth*. R. Br. 184.

40. — while there is a mouthe
For ever his name shall be *couthe*.
Gower, Conf. Am. 6. Ulisses.

From *coude*, by virtue of a false analogy (*would, should*), aided, it may be, by a vicious orthography*, came the modern form of the perfect *could*.

Even in Anglo-Saxon we find the short *o* interchanging with the short *a*, as *mon, con, stonde*, &c. for *man, can, stande*, &c. In the fourteenth century this letter interchanged just as readily with the short *u*. Hence in our MSS. of Robert of Gloucester we find *con* and *conne* representing the singular and plural verb; and Tyrwhitt uses *conne* for the plural, and sometimes *con* for the singular. Our northern MSS. generally retained the *a*, and sometimes used the verb without any change of structure, in all the persons, *thou can, we can*, &c. In the sixteenth century *can* was occasionally conjugated like one of our ordinary verbs, *he canneth, to can*, &c. The verb *to ken*, which we now use as a synonym of *can* (to know), is properly its causative verb. In the Old-English, *ken* signifies 'to show,' 'to teach.'

41. Clerkus þat knowen þys. schoulde *kennen* hyt abrode.—Vis. de P. Pl. pass. 2.

42. Ful'redles may ze ren
With all zoure rewful route
With care men sall zow *ken*
Edward zowre Lord to lout. Minot, p. 23.

The verb *an* was rarely used in our Old-English dialect.

43. — lateth dom this plaid to-breke †
Al swo hit was erur bi-speke—
Ich *an* (grant) wel, cwadh the niȝtegale.
Hule and Niȝtingale, 173. l.

---

* As early as the fourteenth century, *l* appears to have been often dropt in pronunciation after a broad vowel-sound. Hence came the orthographical expedient of adding an *l*, merely to show that the preceding vowel was pronounced broadly; *older* for *outher* (either), *nolt* for *not* (ne wot), *nolt* for *nowt* (neat-cattle), &c. Webster, the American lexicographer, makes *could* a distinct word from *can*. He connects it with the Welsh *gallu* to be able, and thus accounts for the presence of the *l*. Unluckily for this hypothesis, the *l* did not intrude itself till the fifteenth century.

† That is, "Let judgement decide this cause, as it was before agreed."

44. Urgan the geaunt unride
After Sir Tristrem wan—
Tristrem thought that tide
Y take that me Gode *an* (what God gives me)
On a brig he gan abide, &c. Tristr. 3. 7.

45. Gif hit wule *iunnen* waldende hæfuen
Ich wolle wurthliche wreken alle his witherdeden.
If it will grant He that wields the heavens,
Worthily will I wreck all his misdeeds.
Laȝamon, Battle of Bath.

The *i* in *iunnen* represents the Anglo-Saxon *ge*, which is sometimes prefixed to this verb—*ge-unnan*, to give.

Mun, there can be little doubt, is the same verb as the Anglo-Saxon *ge munan*, to think of. In the Old-English it often indicates mere futurity, like the Icelandic *mun*; and the peculiar sense now given to it—that of obligation—appears to have been its latest derivative meaning. The phrase "we mun go," may have taken successively the meanings "we think of going," "we shall go," "we must go." The change of the radical vowel must have been early lost. Minot uses *mun* in both numbers, and in other northern MSS. we find *man* or its substitute *mon* similarly treated. The preterite *munt* is still used in some of our northern counties. If it exist in our southern dialects, it would no doubt take the shape of *mund*, answering to the Anglo-Saxon *ge-munde*.

46. I'm e'en sorry for it—*munneh* (mun I) hold it heeod, while it heart brasts o bit?—Collyer's Tim Bobbin, 7.

47. I sall nocht lang remaine from your presence,
Thocht for ane quhyll *I man* from you depairt.
Lyndsay, Parl. of Correction, 2. 7.

48. *Monestow* never in lede
Nought lain. Tristr. 1. 60.

49. Who so lifes, thai sall se
That *it mun* (will) be ful dere boght
That thir galay-men have wroght. Minot, 12.

50. I trow the king Correctioun
Man mak ane reformatioun
Or it be lang. Lynds. Parl. of Corr. 2. 6.

51. King Markes may rewe
The ring, than he it se
And *moun* (will). Tristr. 1. 21.

52. Calais men now may ze care
And murning *mun* (shall) ze have to mede
Mirth on mold get ze na mare
Sir Edward sall ken zou zoure crede. Minot, p. 34.

53. *Ze man* observe, that thir tumbling verse flowis not on that fassoun as the otheris dois, &c.—King James, Reulis and Cautelis.

54. Now duil fall on me, that we twa *man* depairt.
Lynds. Parl. of Corr. 2. 7.

55. — he neamt a felly, ot wooant abeawt two mile off on him, so *I munt* gooa back ogen thro Rochdale.—Tim Bobbin, 3.

56. — yet *we munt* do some odds or ends, on *I munt* oather breed mowdywarp holes, or, &c.—Tim Bobbin, I.

It is remarkable, that in some of our northern dialects *begin* takes a preterite formed on the same analogy as *couth—begouth*, or as it is now pronounced, *begoud*. *Gan* and *began* are never, it is believed, used to denote present time; they seem however to have narrowly escaped taking their place with our anomalous verbs.

57. There *I begouth* my caris to compleyne.
K. James, Kings Quhair, 79.

58. Lat se, quoth he, now quha beginis—
With that the fowl sevin deadly sinis
Begouth to leip atanis. Dunbar, The Dance.

59. Auld Saunders *begoud* for to wink. A. Wilson's Poems, p. 21.

60. Now *he beguid* to goo (it began to freshen) fro the sud-east.—Shetland Dial. Hibbert's Shetland, p. 512.

May (to be able), *ow* (to be obliged by duty), and *dow* (to prosper) form their perfects according to the usual manner, by affixing the ending *de*; *de* being changed into *te* by virtue of the aspirate preceding—*migh-te, ough-te, dough-te*. The following is the conjugation of *may* in our Old-English MSS.; pres. sing. *may, might, may*; pl. *mowen* or *mowe*; perf. *mighte*; subj. pres. *mowe*; inf. *to mowe*.

61. Tristrem this thief is he
That *may* be not forlain
The peice *thou might* (may'st) her se
That fro min eme was drain. Tristr. 2. 43.

62. And he clepide him and seyde to him, what here I this thing of thee? yelde rekenyng of thi Baylye for *thou myght* (mayest) not now be Baylyf.—Wicl. Luk 16.

63. Þe stanes stondeþ þer so grete, ne more ne *mowe* be,
Evene vp ryȝt and swyþe hye, þat wonder it is to se,
And oþer liggeþ hye aboue, þat a man *may* be of aferd.
R. Glou. 7.

64. Men *mowe* here ensaumple nime to late hire sones wyve
And geue hem vp here land al bi hire lyve
For wel *may* a symple Francoleyn in mysese hym so brynge.
R. Glou. 35.

65. No man *may* serve twey lordes, for &c. *ye moun* not serve God and richesse.—Wicklif, Matt. 6.

66. — that broughte Troye to destruction,
As men *moun* in these olde gestes rede.
Ch. Squieres Tale, 204.

67. — ich bidde þat *ich mowe* (subj. mood) my stat holde þorȝ þe
And þat *þou* vp hym Bretayne *mowe* (subj.) wynne þorȝ me.
R. Glou. 54.

68. I seye to you monye seken to entre and thei schulen not *mowe*.—Wiclif, Luk 13.

69. The greet dai of his wraththe cometh, and who shall *mowe* stande.—Wiclif, Apocalyps, 6.

In our glossaries the plural *moun* is almost always confounded with the verb *mun*, of which we have already spoken.

By a law of letter-change which prevailed widely in the Old-English, the final *g* was changed into *y* when it followed a narrow, and into *w* when it followed a broad vowel. Hence the Anglo-Saxon *mæg* is represented by *may*, and the plural *magon* by *mowen* or *moun*. There are instances however, even in the Anglo-Saxon, in which the singular verb is written with the broad vowel—*mag*, and Ormin always writes it *magg*. *Mag* would be represented in the Old-English by *mow*; and it is probable that this form of the singular verb may be found in our Old-English MSS., but it is difficult to give satisfactory examples, owing to the confusion which prevailed between the two moods, the indicative and subjunctive, and also to the frequent rejection of the final vowel.

Chaucer appears to have looked upon *might* as an obsolete form of the second person, and uses *mayst* as a substitute; and in Tyrwhitt's edition we even find *we may*, *ye may*, &c. Some of our northern MSS. use *may* for all the persons, *thou may*, *we may*, &c.

To owe represents the Anglo-Saxon *agan* to have, to possess, and is clearly the same verb as the Greek ἔχειν. One of its secondary meanings expresses obligation arising from duty, "I owe (ought) to see him;" and in familiar language we still say "I have to see him." In like manner we may perhaps connect the modern sense of *owe* with this its primary meaning. The phrases, "he owes me ten pounds," and "he has ten pounds for me," may have a closer etymological connexion than our knowledge of the world might lead us to expect; and the use of the verb without the dative—"he owes ten pounds"—may be founded on a merely derivative meaning. This verb is rarely met with except in our northern MSS., and consequently exhibits but few changes of structure: pres. *ouh* or *ow*, perf. *oughte*; inf. *to owe*; part. *ought*.

70. Sir, said Saladyn, þank *I auh* (ought) ȝow conne. R. Br. 193.

71. A certaine breid worth fyve schilling & mair
Thow aw (owest) this dog. Henryson, Dog, Wolf and Sheep.

72. I am God most mighty,
To luf me welle thou *awe*[*]. Townley, Myst. 21.

73. Ah wif *ah* lete sortes[†] (qy. sottes) lore
Thah spusing beades thuncheth sore.

But woman ought the fools lore dismiss,
Though wedlock-bands seem to her sore.
Owl and Nightingale, 1469.

74. I wold my myghte were knowne
And honourid as *hit awe*[*] (ought). Townley, Myst. 55.

75. Now wex þe Scottes wode, now haue thei nythe & onde
Who of þat fals blode *ouh* to be king of the londe. R. Br. 249.

76. Lordynges of my chance, wele *ȝe auh* to wite. R. Br. 249.

77. Sir *ye ow* not to be denyed. Townley, Myst. 38.

---

[*] *Awe* in these examples is a mere clerical error for *aw*.

[†] The Oxford MS. reads, "And wif auh lete sottes lore," &c. Mr. Stephenson points the passage thus, "Ah wif, ah, lete," &c., but as he gives us no English version, it is not easy to say how he would translate it.

78. — Steuen þat the lond *auht* (possessed). R. Br. 126.

79. The knight, the which that castle *ought*. F. Q. 6. 3. 2.

80. He said the other day, *you ought* (owed) him a thousand pounds.—Sirrah! do I owe you a thousand pounds?—1 Hen. IV. 3. 3.

81. — Sire vor Godes loue ne let me non man *owe* (have)
Bote he abbe an tuo name. R. Glou. 432.

82. — and besides give some tribute of the love and duty I long have *ought* you.—Spelman.

This verb appears to have early lost its proper conjugation and took the regular inflexions so generally, that from the fourteenth century it may be considered as one of the regular verbs of our standard English.

83. *I owe* (ought) to be baptised of thee & thou comest to me.—Wiclif, Matt. 3.

84. A stern geaunt is he
Of him *thou owest* to drede. Tristr. 3. 39.

85. Lend less than thou *owest* (possessest). Lear, 1. 4.

86. He that ereth, *oweth* (ought) to ere in hope.—Wiclif, 1 Cor. 9.

Dow signifies to avail, to prosper, to be able. In modern provincial speech it is treated as one of the ordinary verbs, " He neither dies nor *dows* (mends), Forby Ray. " He'll never *daw*," Ray. In the Old-English it was rarely used except by northern writers, in whose works it shows but little variety of form: pres. *dow*; perf. *doughte*.

87. I 'll laugh, an' sing, an' shake my leg
As lang 's *I dow* (am able). Burns to J. Lapraik.

88. For cunning men I knaw will sone conclude
It *dow* (avails) nothing. Lyndsay, Compl. of the Papingo.

89. — the streim is there sae stark
And also passeth waiding deep
And braider far than *we dow* (are able) leip.
Montgomery, Cherry and Slae.

90. Thre ȝer in carebed lay
Tristrem the triwe he hight,
Never ne *dought* him day,
For sorrow he had o night. Sir Tristr. 2. 1.

91. — that drowp, that *docht* not in chalmir.
Dunbar, Twa M. Wemen and the Wedo.

Brunne represents the Anglo-Saxon *deah* by *deih* instead of *dow*; as in other Old-English writers, we have *sigh* instead of *saw*, the preterite of *see*.

92. Philip of Flaundres fleih, and turned sonne the bak
And Thebald nouht ne *deih* (prospered), schame of þam men spak. R. Br. 133.

93. The kyng Isaak fleih, his men had no foyson,
Al that tyme he ne *deih*, his partie ȝede doun. R. Br. 159.

Here we have *deih* used as a preterite. *Ow* is occasionally found treated in like manner.

— he saw
94. As to his sycht dede had him swappyt snell
Syn said to thaim " he has payit at he *aw* " (that he owed).
Wallace, 2. 251.

Wat (to know) and *mot* (to be obliged) take *ste* as the affix of their preterite, and the final *t* disappears before the affix both of the preterite and of the second person singular. The first of these verbs is conjugated in our Old-English MSS. as follows: pres. sing. *wot, wost, wot*; plur. *wite*; perf. *wiste*; subj. pres. *wite*; inf. *to wite*; part. *wist* or *witten*. Like most verbs beginning with *w, wot* generally coalesced with its negative *ne*.

95. And seggde thuss till Habraham thatt *witt tu* wel to sothe
Hald Abraham hald up thin hand, ne sla thu noht tin wennchel (child)
Nu *wat i* thatt tu dredest godd. Ormulum, Sacrifice of Isaac.

96. I *not* how that may be—
He wot well that the gold is with us tweye. Ch. Pard. Tale.

97. What! Frankelein parde Sire wel *thou wost*
That, &c. Ch. Frankeleins Prol. 24.

98. But *wete ye* wel in counseil be it seid,
Me reweth sore I am unto hire teyde. Ch. Squieres Prol. 13.

99. *I woot* fro whennes I cam, & whider I go, but *ye witen* not fro whennes I cam, &c.—Wiclif, Jon 8.

100. —the Spirit bretheth where he wole and thou herist his vois, but *thou woost* not from whennes he cometh ne whedar he goeth, &c. Treuli treuli I seye to thee for we speken that that *we witen*, &c.—Wiclif, Jon 3.

101. Lord *y woot* that thou art an harde man, thou repist where thou hast not sowe, &c. His lord answerde and seide, &c. *wistest thou* that I repe where I sewe not, &c.—Wiclif, Matt. 25.

102. Thai *nisten* hou to fare
The wawes were so wode
With winde,
O lond thai wald he gede
Yif thai *wist* ani to finde. Tristr. 34.

103. Thi frendschip schal Y fle
Til *Y wite* (subj. may know) that soth. Tristr. 3. 53.

104. Who so wille *wit* his chance, his lif & his languor, &c.
Open his boke and se. R. Br. 131.

105. Virginius cam *to wete* the juges will. Ch. Doctoures Tale, 176.

106. — sore wondren some on cause of thonder
On ebbe and floud on gossamer and on mist
And on all thing, till that the cause is *wist*.
Ch. Squieres Tale, 252.

107. Thocht I wald not that it war *witten*
Schyr in gud faith, I am, &c. Lyndsay, Parl. of Corr. 3. 6.

In northern MSS. of the fourteenth century, we often find *wot* used in all the persons, *thou wot, we wot*, &c., and in the fifteenth century this verb was generally conjugated as follows: pres. sing. *wot, wottest, wotteth*; plur. *wot*; past tense *wiste*; inf. *to wite*. According to Tyrwhitt's edition, even Chaucer used the phrases *ye wot, they wot*. But we may doubt if so scrupulous a writer would have used the two forms *wottest* and *wost* within the compass of a few lines, as in the Knightes Tale, 152, and in the Pardoneres Tale, 480.

From the past tense *wiste*, our glossarists, &c. manufactured the verb *to wiss* (see Johnson, Nares, Jamieson, &c.); and till lately, our editors always converted the innocent adverb *i-wiss* (certainly) into *I wiss*, I know. The criticisms of the last six or seven years have shown them their mistake*.

Mot seems to have signified primarily, to have license; and in its secondary sense, to be obliged. It was conjugated in the Old-English as follows, pres. sing. *mot*, plur. *moten* or *mote*; perf. *moste*; imper. *mote*; subj. pres. *mote*; subj. perf. *moste*.

108. Man schal bo stille and noȝt grede
He mot (must) bi-wepe his mis-dede. Hule and Niȝtingale, 978.

109. She told hem al that tide
What was her wille to say,
"*Ye moten* (must) slen and hide
Brengwain, that mery may." Tristr. 2. 58.

110. — þys god man Seyn Dunston
Hatede muche to crouny him, gyf he hyt myghte vergon
Ac þo *he moste* nede yt do. R. Glou. 290.

111. — ȝollen *mote thu* (mayst thou shriek) so heȝe
That thu berste bo thin eȝe. Hule and Niȝtingale, 987.

112. Ever *mote thu* ȝolle and wepen (mayst thou shriek and weep)
That thu thi lif *mote* (subj.) forleten. Hule and Niȝtingale, 985.

113. How longe *mote thou* (mayst thou) sailen by the coste
Thou gentil maister, gentil marinere. Ch. Prioresses Prol. p. 348.

114. Were I unbounden, all so *mote I the* (may I speed)
I wolde never eft comen in the snare. Ch. March. Prol. 15.

115. Grace, peace and rest from the hie Trinitie
Mot rest amang this gudlie company.
Lyndsay, Parl. of Corr. 3. 3.

116. Mischief *mought* to that mischance befall
That so has reft us of our merriment. Spens. August.

117. Thenne ich wondrede what he was—
And prayede Pacience, that *ich* apose hym *moste* (might).
Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 7.

118. He wep on God vaste ynou, & cryde mylce & ore
And byhet ȝyf *he moste* (subj. perf. *might*) lybbe, that he wolde
mysdo nan more. R. Glou. 381.

119. And swore onon so *most he* the (might he prosper)
He wolde wite who was he. Alis. 5472.

120. Min English eke is insufficient
It *muste* (subj. perf.) ben a rethour excellent
That coude his colours longing to that art,
If he shuld here descriven any part,
I am not swiche *I mote* speke as I can. Ch. Squieres Tale, 30.

---

* In the Glossary to "Syr Gawayne," edited some three or four years ago by Sir F. Madden, it is conceded that *i wiss* is properly an adverb, but the editor doubts if it were "not regarded as a pronoun and verb by the writers of the fifteenth century." This hypothesis is in the opinion of the writer wholly gratuitous. He believes there is not a single instance in which *wisse* has been used in the sense of *to know*, till our modern glossarists and editors chose to give it that signification.

In ex. 120, *mote* is written for *mot*, and in ex. 115, 119, the final *e* is lost. From the spelling of *mought*, ex. 116, Spenser appears to have confounded *mote* with *might*.

Among our northern writers there seems to have been always a disposition to treat the present tenses of these verbs as preterites. We have already seen examples of *deih* and *ow* so used, and we may now add *mot* to the number.

121. He comandid his men, to dryue out þe couent
The godes him biken, þat þei *mot* (might) tak or hent.
R. Br. 123.

122. — with suerd in his hand
He slouh withouten numbre, befor him *mot* non stand.
R. Br. 189.

Dar might claim to be ranked with the two verbs last-mentioned, inasmuch as it formed its preterite in *ste*; but there are so many interchanges of meaning between *dar* and *tharf* (to need), that it may be convenient to consider these verbs together. They were thus conjugated: pres. sing. *dar, darst, dar*; plur. *durren* or *durre*; perf. *durste*; subj. pres. *durre*; part. *durst*: pres. sing. *tharf*; perf. *thurfte*. We find the first of these verbs used both in the sense of *to dare* and *to need*.

123. He sais behind thi bak, in strange companie
Wordes þat er to lak, *he dar* þe wele diffie. R. Br. 194.

124. A ful gret fool is any conseiller—
That *dare* presume or ones thinken it,
That his conseil shuld passe his lordes wit.
Ch. The March. Tale, 258.

125. *Dare* no man answer in a case of truth? 1 Hen. VI. 2. 4.

126. Where false Plantagenet *dare* not be seen. 1 Hen. VI. 2. 4.

127. — thu ne *darst* domes abide
— thou darest not judgement abide.
Hule and Niȝtingale, 1694.

128. Thuse comith to fore Darie
And seiden "Sire no *darst* nought (needest not) tarye
Of Alisaundre Y schal the wreke." Alis. 2010.

129. Such him thretith ne *durre* him seen (look at him). Alis. 1995.

130. Here fon heo *durre* (need) þe lesse doute but hit be thorw gyle
Of fol (folk) of þe selue lond. R. Glou. 1.

131. — nis of ow non so kene
That *durre* (subj. would dare) abide mine onsene.
Hule and Niȝtingale, 1704.

132. Brut huld to hym Engelond, he ne *durste* (needed not) hym not playne. R. Glou. 22.

Both these meanings are also given to the verb *thar*, perf. *thurste*.

133. — so shal þis deþ for do: *ich þar* (I dare) my lyf legge
Al þat deþ and þe deovel dude. Vis. de Dobet, pass. 4.

134. I was castyn in care so frightly afrayd,
Bot *I thar* (need) not dyspayre, for low is he layd
That I most dred. Townl. Myst. 152.

135. Yff ye wyll oghtte that we kanne do
Ye thar (ye need) bot commaunde hus therto. Sir Amadas, 513.

136. Your dome this day *thar ye* (need ye) not drede.
Townl. Myst. 316.

137. Who so may byde to se that sight
Thay *ther* (need) not drede I wene. Townl. Myst. 159.

138. Ther was no raton of al þe route, for al the reame of Fraunce
That *therste* (durst) have bonde the belle. o boute þe cattes necke.
Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 1. Whit. ed.

139. Scho ne *therst* (durst) speke a word for fere. Octovian, 205.

140. — the Lord Douglas
Hyr in daynte ressawyt has
As it war worthi sekyrli
For scho wes syne the best lady
And the fayrest that men *thurst* se (needed to see).
Barbour's Bruce, 14. 693.

The southern dialects often changed the initial *d* to *th*[*]; and we might therefore infer that *thar* and *thurst* were mere dialectical varieties of *dar* and *durst*. But in the south and west of England, *f* when it closed a syllable, and especially when it followed *r*, was often omitted[†]; hence we might be led to suppose that *thar* was a corruption of *tharf* (to need), more especially as we find in the Old-English *thurte*, which is clearly a corruption of the Anglo-Saxon preterite *thurfte* (needed):—

141. Your fre harte saide theym never nay—
As ofte sithes as thai wald pray
Thai *thurte* (needed) bot aske, and have thare boyn.
Townl. Myst. 317.

As the German *durfen* signifies *to dare*, we can account, on this hypothesis, for *thar* taking the sense of *dare* in ex. 133.

Perhaps the best way of reconciling these difficulties is to suppose: first, that *dar*, in its primary sense, signified (like the Greek θαῤῥεῖν) *to dare*, and also that it took a secondary sense, *to need*, though it is not very easy to say how the two meanings were connected. Secondly, that *dar* in some of our southern dialects became *thar*. And thirdly, that it gave birth to a derivative *tharf*, which was sometimes corrupted into *thar*, and confounded with *thar*, the dialectical variety of *dar*. The chief objection which a modern philologist would urge to these hypotheses, would doubtless be the difference in the initial letters of the Anglo-Saxon *durran* and *þurfan*. But the change of the initial *d* into *th* in our southern dialects may be referred to as one of many arguments, to show how much exaggerated has been the value of the rules—the "canons," as they are termed—which have been published on the subject of Gothic letter-change, and may probably leave us little inclination to follow them on the present occasion.

Shall changed its vowel in the plural till a very late period, but

---

[*] In the Romance of Octovian, we find *than, thonright, thefende*, &c. written for *den, downright, defend*, &c.

[†] As *sar, sarrant, harras, ater*, &c. for *serve, servant, harvest, after*, &c.

in other respects was conjugated much as at the present day: pres. sing. *shall, shalt, shall*; plur. *shullen* or *shulle*; perf. *shulde.*

142. Alle *ye shulen* suffre sclaundre in me in this nyght, for it is writen *I schal* smyte the scheparde and the scheep of the floc *schulen* be scattered, &c.—Wiclif, Matt. 26.

143. But daies *shulen* come whanne the spouse *schal* be taken awey fro hem and thanne *thei schulen* faste.—Wiclif, Matt. 9.

144. But sone *shal he* wepen many a tere,
For women *shuln* him bringen to meschance.
Ch. Monkes Tale, 70.

145. What *shuln we* do? what *shuln we* to him seye?
Shall it be conseil? said the firste shrewe
And *I shall* tellen thee in wordes fewe
What *we shuln* don. Ch. Pard. Tale, p. 334.

146. The erthe *xal* qwake, bothe breke and brast,
Beryelis and gravys *xul* ope ful tyth[*],
Ded men *xul* rysen, &c. Cov. Myst. Prol. p. 18.

147. *Thei xul* not drede the flodys flowe,
The fflod *xal* harme them nowht.
Cov. Myst. Noah's Flood, p. 43.

In our northern MSS. *shall* is used in both numbers, and Tyrwhitt gives us in the plural both *shall* and *shulle.* It would be difficult to say whether this latter inconsistency is to be charged on Chaucer, his "scrivener," or his editor.

The verbs we have considered are most of them distinguished by using in the present tense the forms of the preterite,—a peculiarity which stands out in more marked relief, the deeper we penetrate into the antiquity of our language. Another of their peculiarities, which, though it may be found in the Anglo-Saxon, has chiefly developed itself in our later English, is a tendency to use their regular preterite as a present tense; *ought, must, durst, would,* &c. are used with a present signification, not only in familiar language, but also (some of them at least) in the measured language of composition. The reason of this is tolerably obvious: the past tense subjunctive is our conditional tense—"I *had* gone, if" &c.—and it differed from the past tense indicative merely in rejecting the inflexion (*st*) of the second person singular. Hence the two tenses were readily confounded, and as the transition was easy from a conditional to a direct assertion, the phrases "I should like," "I could wish," &c. at last came to be considered as if they were mere equivalents of "I wish." Arguing from analogy, we might expect that the same hypothesis would account for the peculiar inflexions of the present tenses, *can, ouh, dar,* &c.; but the forms of our earlier grammar present an insuperable difficulty in the way of such inference. For instance, the Anglo-Saxon inflects the last verb in the singular of the present indicative thus, *dear, dearst, dear,* while in the present subjunctive all the three persons are represented by *durre.*

Will differs from the verbs we have hitherto considered, in making

---

[*] In this work the radical vowel often remains unchanged, particularly in the first and second persons.—*we xal, ye xal.*

its first and third persons end in *e*. *E* is the proper inflexion of the present subjunctive, and in the Mæso-Gothic *will* takes the inflexions of this tense throughout. We shall not attempt to explain the anomaly. As we gradually clear up the obscurities of our language, the relations which these irregular verbs bear to our ordinary grammar will be better understood, and speculation, if needed, may then be adventured upon more safely.

This verb varied its vowel according to the dialect. In our southern dialects the broad vowel was generally retained both in the past and in the present tense: pres. sing. *wolle, wolt, wolle*; plur. *wolle*; perf. *wolde*:—

148. Deye we raþer wyþ honour & seweþ me in þys place,
Vor *icholle* (ich wolle) my lyf dere mon selle, þoru God grace.
R. Glou. 397.

149. —bere over fro me this cuppe; but not that *I woll*, but that *thou wolt* be done.—Wiclif, Mark 14.

150. An *thou wolt* Louerd, help þe to hym that faderles ys.
R. Glou. 329.

151. — why *wolt thou* letten me
More of my tale, than another man. Ch. Prol. to Melebeus.

152. *Woult* weep? *woult* fight? *woult* fast? *woult* tear thyself?
Hamlet, 5. 1.

153. Knightes he seyde what *wolle ȝe*? R. Glou. 397.

Wiclif's use of these forms shows that in the fourteenth century they had pretty well established themselves in our written language. In Shakespeare's time they were once more provincialisms, and like other provincial forms of speech, were used by him merely to give force to his irony.

In some of our dialects the narrow vowel seems to have been preferred:—

154. —*I wille* neuer more in þi trespas þink. R. Br. 201.

155. — if *he wild* com ageyn, the lond forto were
Neuer more to Danes kyng faiþe suld thei bere. R. Br. 45.

156. — he suld voide þe lond, if he his life *wild* saue. R. Br. 14.

157. Sone therafter bifel a cas
That hirself with child was,
When God *wild* sche was unbounde
And deliuerd. Lay Le Fraine, 86.

158. — and volks *wid* stop me to kiss en.
Dev. Dial. 3. Mrs. Gwatkyn's ed.

There appears, at one time, to have been a tendency to use the narrow vowel in the second person singular and the broad vowel in the other persons:—

159. My fader, if it is possible, passe this cuppe fro me, netheles not as *I wole* but as *thou wilt*.—Wiclif, Matt. 26.

160. — if *thou wilt* werchen as the wise
Do alway so, as women *wol* the rede. Ch. Monkes Tale, 114.

In modern English we have returned to the usage which prevails in our Anglo-Saxon MSS., and use the narrow vowel in the present, and the broad vowel in the preterite—*will, would*.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. DECEMBER 12, 1845. No. 39.

Professor KEY in the Chair.

The following works were laid on the table :—

"On the Antiquity of the Book of Genesis," by H. Fox Talbot, Esq., and "Hermes," Nos. I. and II., by the same author; presented by the author.

A paper was then read :—

"On the Origin and Import of the Genitive Case." By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

To constitute connected and intelligible language, it is not sufficient to place words in juxtaposition; it is also of paramount necessity that the *relations* of the words with each other should be correctly indicated. In the Indo-European languages, the relations of verbs are denoted by personal terminations, elements implying time, contingency—v. t. q.—and those of nouns by changes of form called *cases*. It has been common among grammarians to regard those terminational changes as evolved by some unknown process from the body ~~of the noun, as the branches of a tree spring from the stem~~; or as elements unmeaning in themselves, but employed arbitrarily or conventionally to modify the meanings of words. This latter theory is countenanced by A. W. Schlegel, in a well-known passage in his work, 'Observations sur la Langue et la Littérature Provençales,' the following extract from which will sufficiently explain the author's views. After dividing all known languages into three classes,—languages destitute of grammatical structure, languages employing affixes, and languages with inflexions, he observes, respecting the class last-mentioned :—

"I am of opinion, nevertheless, that the first rank must be assigned to languages with inflexions. They might be denominated the organic languages, because they include a living principle of development and increase, and alone possess, if I may so express myself, a fruitful and abundant vegetation. The wonderful mechanism of these languages consists in forming an immense variety of words, and in marking the connexion of the ideas expressed by those words by the help of an inconsiderable number of syllables, which, viewed separately, have no signification, but which determine with precision the sense of ~~the words to which~~ they are attached. By modifying ~~radical letters, and by adding~~ derivative syllables to the roots, derivative words of various sorts are formed, and derivatives from those derivatives. Words are compounded from several roots to express complex ideas. Finally, substantives, adjectives and pronouns are declined, with gender, number and case; verbs are conjugated throughout voices, moods, tenses, numbers and persons, by employing, in like manner, terminations, and sometimes augments, which by themselves signify nothing. This method is attended with the advantage of enunciating in a single word the principal idea, frequently greatly modified and extremely complex already, with its whole array of accessory ideas and mutable relations*."

The writer having already stated his objections against this theory of Schlegel, in an article in a well-known periodical, does not need to repeat them at present. It is doubtless known to those acquainted with the modern school of German philology, that several distinguished contemporaries of Schlegel have espoused a doctrine diametrically opposite to his. Not to mention W. Humboldt and Pott, Professor Franz Bopp has, in his 'Comparative Grammar,' instituted an elaborate analysis of all the grammatical terminations, with a view of identifying them with pronouns or pronominal roots. We shall not now inquire whether all his assumptions are to be implicitly relied upon: but no one acquainted with his works will refuse him the credit of great learning, research and ingenuity, or deny that he has made out a *primâ facie* case for his leading position deserving at least an attentive consideration.

The object of the present paper is chiefly to discuss a single point of the general subject; namely, the probable origin and import of the termination of the genitive case, especially in Sanscrit masculine nouns in *ă*, which if they do not constitute the bulk of the language, form at all events a considerable proportion of it. The termination in question is *sya*; nom. *vrikas*, a wolf; gen. *vrikasya*; which Bopp identifies with the Vedic pronoun *sya*; observing that this pronoun is evidently compounded from the demonstrative *sa* = this, and the relative *ya* = who. Bopp does not attempt to give the rationale of the combination; nor has he, or any other German author, as far as we know, shown by an extensive induction from other languages, that there is any proper or usual connexion between the functions of the relative pronoun and those of the genitive case.

It would be rash to assert that the genitive always and necessarily includes a relative pronoun, since there is no doubt that this modification of the sense of a noun may be, and in fact frequently is, expressed in other ways. Evidence will however be produced to show that it *can be* so expressed; and that there is ground for inquiring whether the principle may not operate in cases which have not hitherto been supposed to include this element.

The Semitic languages, which, generally speaking, have no cases, employ various contrivances for expressing the relation of possession or qualification, usually denoted by the genitive of the Indo-Europeans. The most common method in the older languages is the so-called *status constructus*. In this, as is well known, the modified word is not, as with us, the predicate or qualifying noun, but the subject or leading one. For example, in the Hebrew phrase *father of the king* (ăbi-melech), *āb*, father, shortens its vowel and is augmented by a terminal syllable; while *melech*, king, remains unaffected: much as if we were to say *patris rex*, instead of *pater regis*. Some remarks on the supposed analysis of this construction will be

---

* P. 14 *et seq.*

given hereafter: at present it is more properly connected with the leading object of the present essay to observe, that besides this method of expressing the genitive case, there is a periphrasis with the relative pronoun, of most common occurrence in the Aramean languages, but not unknown in Hebrew.

Thus, Hebr. shir *asher* lĕ Shelomoh, the song of Solomon, literally, the song *which* to Solomon. Syriac, nauso *d*-simo, chest of silver = chest *which* silver. Frequently this construction is rendered more precise, particularly in Chaldee and Syriac, by connecting with it a pronominal suffix: em-*ho d*-Jeshua = the mother *of him—who* Jesus, *i. e.* the mother of Jesus; barth-*ho*-*d*-Herodia, the daughter of her who Herodias. As this form furnishes a complete and intelligible resolution of the phrase, it is possible that there may be an ellipsis of the personal pronoun in those cases where the relative alone is employed; a supposition which may not be without its use when we come to consider parallel cases from other languages.

The Samaritan *d*, the Ethiopic *za* and the Amharic *ya* are, in like manner, at once relative pronouns and signs of the genitive case, as will be shown by subsequent examples. The last-mentioned is remarkable for its external identity with the Sanscrit relative *ya*, which however in all probability is purely accidental. The vulgar Arabic has several analogous methods of expressing the genitive, as may be seen in Dombay's 'Grammatica Mauro-Arabica.' One of these signs of possession, *dsa*, appears to be closely cognate with the Ethiopic *za*, originally a relative pronoun. Of the various prefixes indicating the genitive given in Professor Newman's contribution to our knowledge of the Berber language, lately published in the 'Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes,' several are clearly identical with forms of the relative pronoun, as we shall have a future opportunity of pointing out more fully. This, by the way, may serve as a further confirmation of the true Semitic character of the Berber.

It is true that most grammarians regard the Aramean prepositive *dolath*, when it is the sign of the genitive case, not as a relative, but a preposition or particle, equivalent to the Latin *de*. We have however a decisive proof to the contrary in the Ethiopic. When the leading noun is masculine, *za*, the masculine relative, is employed as the sign of the genitive; but when the governing noun is feminine, the connective is not *za*, but *enta*, the *feminine* form of the relative. It is hardly necessary to say that a mere particle could not be affected in this way, the feminine gender of a preposition being something difficult to conceive.

Several other African languages present results perfectly analogous. The forms of the Coptic have not been sufficiently studied to justify the expression of a positive opinion as to their nature. Several however of the signs of the genitive case correspond so closely in form with various demonstrative and relative pronouns, as to excite a strong suspicion of the community of their origin. Leaving this point for further investigation, we proceed to observe, that in the Galla language *kan* is both the relative pronoun and the sign of the genitive case: *e.gr.* eni *kan* duffu, he that comes; kitāba *kan* dalota, *kan* Jāsūs Christos, the book of the generation of Jesus Christ: *lit.* the book *which* the generation *who* Jesus Christ. The Yoruba language, spoken on the western coast, exhibits precisely the same phænomenon, except that *ti* supplies the place of *kan*: ille *ti* mo wo, the house *which* I pulled down; ille *ti* babba, house *of* father. The similarity of the Yoruba *ti* to the Syriac *d* and the Ethiopic *za* is probably accidental, but the functions of each are precisely the same.

Some of the Polynesian languages express the relation of possession by the mere juxtaposition of the terms, and consequently throw no light on the point which we are discussing. The greater part of them however employ prefixes, many of which are identical with forms of demonstrative or relative pronouns, or so similar as to encourage the belief that they ~~are of~~ kindred origin. Thus, in Malagassy, ~~*ny* is both demonstrative pronoun or definite~~ article, and the sign of the genitive case: *ny* filazany *ny* razany *ny* Jaisosy Kraisty, *the* book *of* the generation *of* Jesus Christ. In the Marquesan, the Hawaiian and the New Zealand languages, *na* is equally the pronoun of the third person = *he*, *that*, &c. and the prefix denoting the genitive. Respecting the last-mentioned language, Dr. Dieffenbach observes in the sketch of New Zealand Grammar appended to his "Travels," that the relative is expressed by the *genitive* of the personal pronoun: *e. gr.* the man *who* showed, te tangata *nana* e wakakite, *lit.* the man *of him* showed. This resolution of the phrase appears so much at variance with the principles of logic that there is great room to question its soundness. The analogy of other languages would rather lead us to believe, that for the sake of greater precision, the demonstrative element *na* is doubled to form a relative, much as in Norse and Anglo-Saxon: *sa-er*; *se-þe* = who, *lit.* the-the, or the-that. The object of this duplication appears to be to establish a more precise connexion between the antecedent and the relative clauses, a portion of the complex expression being referred to each.

The forms which we have hitherto considered are strictly analytic, and in some of them, especially the Aramean and the Ethiopic, the identity of the genitival prefixes with the relative pronoun does not admit of a doubt. Now, though synthetic forms are not necessarily strictly parallel with the analytic ones of the same import, it is clearly possible that they *may* be so. No one disputes that the Latin *mecum* is in all respects equivalent to *σὺν ἐμοὶ*, or that the Spanish future *cantaré*, I will sing, is a mere transposition of *hé de cantar*, I have to sing. In like manner, when we find in Sanscrit or any similar language a termination potentially equivalent to a prefix in a Semitic tongue, or to a significant postfix in a Tartarian or American one, there is at least an ostensible ground for inquiring whether all may not virtually be different shapes of the same thing.

We can indeed have no direct evidence respecting such forms as the Sanscrit *vrĭkasya*, since we know too little of the earliest state of the language to pronounce positively respecting the precise force and composition of its numerous affixes. But we can perceive that the termination of the word in question is to the eye and the ear the same as the relative pronoun *ya*; and we may argue without imputation of any great rashness, that if *which wolf* can mean *of a wolf* in Syriac or Ethiopic, *wolf which* may have precisely the same import in another tongue. This view may be strengthened by further analogies, some of which we shall briefly notice.

In the popular dialects of India related to Sanscrit, and commonly supposed to be descendants of it, the genitive is in most cases formed by affixes, commonly *kā, kī, kē*, which exhibit the remarkable peculiarity of always agreeing in gender with the governing noun. Thus in the phrase "the *brother* of Jesus" the genitive would be Jesu*kā*; but "the *mother* of Jesus" would require a different form, Jesu*kī*. Here, we may observe in the first instance that this phænomenon proves clearly that the affix does not belong to the noun to which it is attached, but to the one which governs it, and with which it is in grammatical concord. Secondly, the termination is in the majority of instances identical with the Sanscrit interrogative pronoun, which in many languages is notoriously closely connected with the relative in import, and frequently in form, and may in fact become a substitute for it in propositions where doubt or contingency is implied. We shall probably therefore not greatly err if we resolve the expression into the component parts—brother *who* Jesus, mother *who* Jesus, i. e. *of* Jesus, analogous to the constructions which we have been considering in analytic languages. It may be also worth inquiring whether the same solution is not applicable to the numerous Sanscrit attributives in *ka* and *ya*, which are generally equivalent to the genitive of the noun from which they are formed, and are compounded with an element externally not differing from the interrogative and relative pronouns. In Slavonic there is a general disinclination to the employment of the genitive case, the place of which is supplied by possessive adjectives. One leading form of those in *ii*, fem. *iya*, is identical with the emphatic or definite form of ordinary adjectives, which in the cognate Lithuanian are visibly formed by affixing the demonstrative pronoun *jis*. Bopp, in his 'Comparative Grammar,' refers this element to the Sanscrit relative *ya*, and argues with great probability that the definite forms of adjectives in all the ancient Teutonic languages are of the same origin. Supposing this point to be established, it is obvious that a genitive case, equivalent in import and similar in form, may include the same element within it.

Here again the analytic languages serve to aid our theory. By prefixing the relative, the Syriac, Ethiopic, and other tongues form adjectives from substantives, ordinal numbers from cardinals, and possessive pronouns from personal suffixes, and there seems nothing extravagant in supposing that a relative or any other pronoun may exercise the same functions at the end of a word that it does at the beginning. It would indeed be easy to point out many instances where the postfixes of older languages have become prefixes or distinct prepositive words in more recent ones.

We may here properly consider the Afghan or Pushtu, both on account of its local position and its general affinity to the dialects of India Proper. Some of its forms are remarkable, and it is conceived of great importance for the elucidation of the present inquiry. Respecting the genitive case, Professor Dorn in his valuable Memoir on the Pushtu* makes the following observations:—

"The genitive is formed by prefixing the word *da*, which however is not to be regarded as a proof of affinity between Pushtu and Semitic (inasmuch as in Chaldee also, *d* serves to form the genitive). This *d* [in Pushtu] is evidently of the same origin as the German *der, die, das*; and we shall hereafter find it again among the pronouns. I conceive indeed that this *da* was originally written *dah*, and that it is nothing more than the pronoun demonstrative. This idea is confirmed by our finding *dah* in Pushtu works employed as a sign of the genitive case, as for example *dah du kum*, of both worlds."

Professor Ewald takes the same view of the matter in his paper on the Afghan language published in the "Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes," some time before the appearance of Dorn's Memoir, where he observes that the genitival prefix *da* is a demonstrative with the force of a relative. Neither Dorn nor Ewald gives any analysis of another remarkable prefix of the genitive, viz. *tsa*, restricted in that particular form to the pronoun of the first person, but probably identical in origin with *sa*, the prefix of the second person: e. gr. *mā*, I; *tsa-mā*, of me; *tā*, thou; *sa-tā*, of thee. Here we may observe, that the consonant *tsa*, peculiar to the Afghan language, is not related to the dentals or sibilants, but to the *palatals*, being in fact frequently commutable with *cha* = Pers. چ; and we may therefore reasonably suspect from known analogies, that, as a formative of the genitive case, it is a mere mutation of the relative pronoun *chah*.

The above phænomena are the more important from the circumstance that the Pushtu is confessedly an Indo-European dialect, occupying a medium place between the Persian and the dialects of India. If, as we have great reason to believe, its genitival prefixes are equivalent in import and cognate in origin to the postfixes of the Hindee dialects, and those again may be traced to the Sanscrit relative or interrogative pronoun, various interesting conclusions, too obvious to be insisted upon, would be deducible from the fact. It is remarkable that the postfix of the genitive case in Sikh or Punjābī is *dā*, identical in form with the Afghan prefix; and that there are traces of *da* as a demonstrative root in various Indian languages: *e. gr.* Sanscr. *idam*, this; Zend. *dem, dim* = Sanscr. *tam*, Gr. τόν: accusative of the demonstrative pronoun *ho* = Sanscr. *sa*. It is possible indeed that this form may be only a modification of the more original root *ta*; but it is found in so many languages, that it may at all events be regarded as very ancient.

With respect to the languages of Southern India not related to

---

* Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg, 1840.

Sanscrit, the Tamul, of which the others are only sub-dialects, presents no direct analogy, since in it the relative pronoun is entirely wanting, being usually supplied by the participle. There is however a construction in the higher dialect, or Shem Tamul, which seems to deserve a little notice. A class of participial words called *vineiyechchams* is used extensively to supply the place of conjunctions and other connectives. Thus *enru*, the past vineiyechcham of *enakiratu*, to say, to call, performs the functions of *that* (*quod* or *ut*) and its future *ennum* serves to denote a general relation between the terms which it connects, equivalent to a genitive case. Thus, *puyal-ennum-vāri*, the water of the clouds, literally, the water which may be, or is to be, called clouds; in other words, water respecting which clouds may be predicated, or more concisely, *cloud-water*. It is obvious that the word *which*, or *that*, supposing it to exist in Tamul, might exercise precisely the same office, *quod* being potentially equivalent to *τὸ λεγόμενον*; and thus it appears that the above construction bears a close analogy to the bulk of those which we have already analysed.

The Tartarian class of languages also furnishes a valuable confirmation of this theory, which cannot be better stated than in the words of Dr. W. Schott (Versuch über die Tatarischen Sprachen, pp. 52, 53):—"The Turco-Tartarians denote the genitive by the form *ning*, which may be recognized as the Manchu *ni* with a nasal increment. This nasal addition answers [in sound] with the Turco-Tartarians to the German *ng*; with the Osmanlis however it is softened to *ñ*. The *ning* of the Turkish dialects may be regarded as the full form of the genitive of the higher Asiatics, or at least most nearly approaching it: and we actually find in the Manchu itself a postpositive particle *ningge*, which does not indeed become a genitive in that language*, but expresses a relation, or stands for the relative pronoun. The agreement in form of both is too striking to be explained as merely casual; and as to the transition of the relative into a genitival particle, we find examples of it in other languages. Several Chinese elements, which originally only expressed a relation to something preceding,—a sort of relative pronoun or *articulus postpositivus*, become also exponents of a genitival relation. This transition is shown in a remarkably unequivocal manner by the particle *ti*, peculiar to the modern style, which is as frequently a sign of the genitive as a relative†: e. gr. *ngo-ti*, mine, from *ngo*, I: thus, *ngo-ti hiung*, my (older) brother, and on the same principle, *ngo-ti phung-yeu ti hiung-ti*, my friend's brother. The word governed becomes connected with the governing one, as a sort of possessive adjective."

Schott's remarks on the extension of the principle to the Finnish languages are curious and instructive, but cannot be conveniently abridged so as to find a place in the present paper.

We may here briefly notice the Semitic construct form mentioned

---

* It appears however as the formative of the absolute possessive pronoun, which is notoriously allied to the genitive in many languages: e. gr. *mi-ningge* = *le mien*.

† The identity of this Chinese particle with the *ti* of the Yorubas in form and functions is not a little curious.

at the commencement of the present paper. In Hebrew masculines singular, the governing noun does not alter its termination, except in a few instances; but in Ethiopic, the syllable *a* is regularly affixed: e. gr. *wald*, son; wald*a* Māryām, the son of Mary. A probable explanation of this form may be found in languages where the governing noun is regularly accompanied by a pronominal affix denoting *his*, *her*, *its*: v. t. q. as in Hungarian, where "the birth of Jesus," Jesus, or Jesusnak születtes-*e*, is literally "Jesus," or "to Jesus, birth—*his*." If therefore we suppose that the termination *a* in Ethiopic construct nouns, -*i* and *u* in Hebrew and Arabic ones, and *t* or *th* in feminines, are derived from pronominal affixes, which they are not unlike in form, we shall have, at all events, a plausible solution of the matter.

In the Albanian language, the governing noun, if masculine, regularly subjoins *i*, but if feminine, *e*, which are in fact a demonstrative pronoun of the third person. Similar to this is the *izafet* construction of the Persians, where an *i*, written in certain cases, but more generally in unpointed texts only perceptible in the pronunciation, is subjoined to the governing noun: *dost*-ĭ *puser*, the friend of the boy; *puser*-ĭ *dost*, the boy of the friend. Pott in his remarks on the Belūchi language ingeniously suggests, that this syllable is in fact a relative pronoun, cognate with the Sanscrit *ya*. Supposing this to be the case, it would be exactly analogous to the Semitic constructions with the relative prefix, but would differ in the order of its arrangement from the Sanscrit, assuming the latter to include the relative in the termination of the genitive.

According to Lassen, the same formation of the genitive occurs in Pehlĕvi: *kup-i-Fars*, mountain of Persia; it is also employed as a connective between the substantive and the qualifying adjective: *andarvai ī rushan*, the bright atmosphere. Respecting these constructions, Lassen observes, "I believe that this is in both cases to be explained from the relative *ji* [yi] for *ja* [ya]. Constructions in Zend like *gāum jim Sughdō sajanem* = regionem quam Sughdae situm; *puthrĕm jat Aurvat ąspahē* = filium quod (quem) Aurvataspis, in which the relative denotes the connexion of a qualifying word with a preceding noun, lead to this assumption." This Zend construction is remarkable for its similarity to the analytic forms employed in Semitic.

The above is only a small part of the evidence which might be adduced in support of the assumed connection between the termination or prefixed sign of the genitive case and the relative, or occasionally, the interrogative or demonstrative pronoun. Even languages which have no distinct relative, but express it synthetically, help to confirm the theory; as for instance, in Basque the relative postfix is *an*, and a common termination of the genitive *en*. Similar phænomena are presented by several American languages, if the analyses in Adelung's 'Mithridates' are to be relied on.

In conclusion we may briefly observe, that the object of all the different forms of the genitive case is to establish the same sort of connexion between *words*, that the relative does between *clauses*;

namely, to show that one of them may be *predicated* of the other; thus serving as a kind of logical copula. It is in fact of the very essence of human intellect to perceive the relations of things, and of human language to enunciate them; and if we could not refer those relations to their proper subjects and objects, we should not be able to make our ideas intelligible. The particular point which we have been discussing is still open to further investigation; since many of the phænomena connected with it have not even been adverted to. Could the view we have taken of it be finally established, it would lead to the presumption that Schlegel's theory of the non-significance of grammatical inflexions must be radically unsound, since it is clear that if one termination be originally significant, all others may be equally so; and it is reasonable to suppose that the languages of the Indo-European class, which Schlegel had principally in view, are organized throughout on the same general system. Arguing *à priori*, it seems more rational to presume that the human mind would employ means obviously adapted to a definite end, than that it would be guided by blind chance or mere caprice in its operations. It would also be difficult to give a plausible reason why the barbarous Finns, Tartars, and similar tribes should express logical and grammatical relations by significant postfixes, and that the most cultivated and intellectual races in the world should employ mere jargon for the same purpose. Such theories appear too nearly related to the exploded doctrine of occult causes in natural philosophy; and if they are to be admitted, they ought at all events to be more satisfactorily proved than has hitherto been done.

A few select examples of the principal constructions alluded to in the preceding inquiry are here subjoined.

Hebrew, *Asher*. Relative: *asher* lo hayyam, cujus est mare; *lit.* who to him [is] the sea.
Sign of Genitive: haggibborim *asher* le-David, the warriors of David.

Contracted form, *sh*. *She*-l-i, of me; *lit.* which to me.
mittatho *she*-le Shelomo, the couch of Solomon; *lit.* the couch *of him*, who, or which, to Solomon.

Chaldee, *di*. Rel.: *di* medar-*hon*, whose habitation; *lit.* who habitation of them.
Gen.: nehar *di* nur, river of fire.

Syriac, *d*. Rel.: *d*-bar David, who [was] the son of David.
Gen.: cthobo *d*-musiqi, book of music.
— br-e *d*-Chakim, the son of Hakim; *lit.* son of him who Hakim.

Samaritan, *d*. Rel.: cul *d*-ramach, all which creepeth.
Gen.: barāha *d*-Pharan, the wilderness of Pharan.

Ethiopic, *za*, *enta*. Rel.: wald *za*-rakab-o, the son who found him.
enta atmaq-o, [she] who baptized him.
Gen.: Mazmor *za* Dāwith, psalm of David.
— Anqatz *enta* samāy, the gate of heaven.

Amharic, *ya*. Rel. and Gen.; *ya*nabara *ya*-Heli lĕdsli, *who* was the son *of* Heli.

Vulgar Arabic, *dsa**, *dse*. Gen.: el sifr *dse* 'l kitab, the volume of the book.

The Berber forms are so peculiar, and withal so important, that they appear to deserve a more detailed examination. The first thing which strikes us is the variety of forms, greatly exceeding that of any other Semitic dialect. Some of these are evidently compound, others abbreviated, and some apparently mere dialectical variations. It is difficult to determine the original forms with certainty; but as far as may be judged from a comparison of the cognate dialects, the following appears to be an approximation to the real state of the case. There is one set of forms consisting of a consonant followed by a simple vowel: *wa*; *tha* or *ta*, *gha* or *ya*; *na*; *da* or *dsa*; *ka*; or of a consonant preceded by a vowel: *aw*; *ath*; *agh* or *ay*; *an*; *al*; *ads* or *ad*; *ak*.

These are sometimes combined into such forms as *awwi*; *aghi* or *ayyi*; *akka*; *anni*; *wayyi*; *sayyi*; *winna*; *widsa*; *widsak*; *anwa*; *anta*; *natta*, *uyawmi*; or abbreviated into the simple prefixes: *w*; *u*; *ds* or *d*; *gh* or *y*; *n*; *k*.

In their primitive acceptation, they appear for the most part, if not altogether, to have been *demonstratives*; but they are also extensively employed in the following capacities: 1. personal pronouns; 2. relatives and interrogatives; 3. particles, especially prepositions and conjunctions; 4. genitival prefixes; 5. formatives of verbs and abstract nouns. To enter into all the details of the above divisions would amount to an analysis of the entire structure of the Semitic languages, on which, it is believed, they are calculated to throw considerable light. It may be sufficient for our present purpose to observe that the shorter forms *an*, *am*, *al*, *ay*, *aw*, *ghi* or *yi*, *ni*, *n*, *w*, *u*, are preferred as signs of the genitive case; being at the same time occasionally used as relatives, though not so frequently as the longer forms. A few examples may suffice for the present.

Relative. *wi* ikhza Rabbi, whom God cursed.
ur illi *w*-araykishnan, there is not [any] who enters.
Genitive. akadum *uw* warghaz, the face of the man.

The form most commonly employed is *an* (relative and demonstrative *anni*), especially with substantives and pronominal suffixes.

baba, father; gen. *an*-baba.
thakli, female slave; gen. *an*-thakli.
an-nagh, of us.
an-wan, of you.
an-san, of them.

Sometimes, as in Aramaic, the pronominal suffix is also inserted: *e. gr.*

ammi-*s* *an*-baba, son of the father;
lit. son *of him*—*who* father.

---

* The same element appears to be included in the relative pronoun *elledsi*, q. d. the—who. *Dsu* is also said to be used as a relative by the Tajjite Arabs.

Examples of the remaining forms, too numerous to be here specified, will be found in Newman's Grammar, and Venture's French and Berber Dictionary, lately published by the Société de Géographie at Paris.

Galla, *kan*. Rel.: eni *kan* duffu, he that comes.
Gen.: *kan* Judaia bosonâti, in the wilderness of Judea.

Yoruba, *ti*. Rel.: ille *ti* mo wo, the house which I pulled down.
Gen.: ille *ti* babba, house of father.

Malagassy, *ny*. Demonstr. and gen.: *ny* mpanjaky *ny* Jiosy, the king of the Jews.

Hawaiian, *na*. [Pronoun of third person, *he, it*.]
Gen.: parau *na* te Atua, the word of God.

Sanscrit, *ya*. [Relative.] Gen.: vrikas-*ya*, of a wolf.
ka-s. [Interrogative.] Gen.: asma-*kam*, of us. [Compare the possessive forms—mama*ka*, meus; tava*ka*, tuus; asma*ka* (in the Vedas), noster.]

Hindostani. Gen. masc. form, Kudā-*kū* betā, son of God.
Gen. fem. form, Yisu-*ki* mā, mother of Jesus.

Guzeratī, *nō*. [Pali demonstr. *na*?]
Gen.: chokara-*nō*, of a boy. Fem.: Yisu*nī* mā, mother of Jesus.

Punjābī, *dā*. [Zend. demonstr. *da*?]
Gen.: kavi-*dā*, of a poet. Fem.: Yisu*dī* mātā, mother of Jesus. [Compare the Pushtū genitival *prefix*, *da*-bādishah, of a king, &c., and the demonstrative pronoun *dā saray*, this man.]

In other dialects we find *chō, chī, jō, jī*, as terminations of the genitives. These may be probably regarded as modifications of the Sanscrit interrogative and relative pronouns, *ka*-s, *ya*. *Jō, je*, are relatives in Harotī, Guzeratī, and it is believed also in other dialects.

Persian, Pehlĕvi, Beluchī, *i*. Gen.: kup-i-Fars, mountain of Persia.

Albanian, *i. e.* [Definite article, *the*.]
Gen.: Pirri *i* Abrahamit, son of Abraham. Fem.: ëma *e* Jesuit, mother of Jesus.

The Manchu postfixed relative *ningge, ngge*, of which *jingge* is a collateral form, has a variety of functions, serving, *inter alia*, to form —1. Participles, active and passive: aracha-*ngge* = ὁ γράψας and τὸ γραφόμενον. 2. Possessive adjectives, often resolvable into a genitive: niyalma-i-*ngge*, human, *q. d.* characteristic *of* man. 3. Possessive pronouns: mini-*ngge*, mine, q. d. *quod mei* (est). This is with great probability identified by Schott with the Turco-Tartarian and Finnish forms of the genitive.

Uighur, Jaghatai, &c., *ning*, at-*ning*, of a horse.

Osmanli, *un, nun*: adem-*uñ*, of a man; cheshmeh-*nuñ*, of a fountain.

Finnish, Lappish, &c., *n, en*: cala-*n*, of a fish; kabmak-*en*, of a boat.

Hungarian, *nek*, *en*[*]: á-tenger-*nek*, of or to the sea; á-hegy-*en*-tal, on the other side of the mountain.

The hypothesis of Bopp, that the possessive terminations of Indo-European adjectives, numerals, &c., and the formatives of many abstract nouns were originally pronouns, seems to derive some support from the following analytic constructions in Semitic.

Syriac, *ruch*, spirit, *d*-ruch [*lit*. which spirit = *πνευματικός*].

Cardinals: trēn, 2; tloth, 3.
Ordinals: *da*-trēn, second; *da*-tloth, third. [Compare Sanscr. dwiti*ya*, triti*ya*, &c.]

Ethiopic, *tzarq*, rag; *za*-tzarq, ragged: lamtz, leprosy; *za*-lamtz, leprosus: Maryam, Mary; *za*-Maryam, Marianus.

Cardinal: selus, three.
Ordinal: menbāka *za*-selus, lectio feriæ tertiæ.

---

[*] The variety of functions exercised by the element *na* and its modifications in languages of almost every part of the world is not a little remarkable. Compare New. Zeal. *nana*, Lazian *nam* = qui; Gael. *nan*, *nam*, plur. gen. article; Sanscr. *nām*, termination of gen. plur.; Pali and Armenian *na* = hic, iste, &c. Other examples have been already given. All these significations may be referred to the simple demonstrative pronoun as the radix.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Vol. II. JANUARY 16, 1846. No. 40.

Professor Wilson, V. P., in the Chair.

There was laid on the table—

"A Comparative Grammar of the Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German, and Slavonic Languages," by Professor F. Bopp. Translated principally by Lieut. Eastwick: London, 1845. Presented by Lord Francis Egerton.

The following gentlemen were elected Members of the Society:—

John William Wilcock, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister at Law.

Rev. Dr. Hume, Professor of English Literature, Collegiate Institution, Liverpool.

Walter Deverell, Esq., Secretary to the School of Design, London.

Two papers were then read:—

1. "Notices of English Etymology:"—*Continued.* By Hensleigh Wedgwood, Esq.

Backgammon.—The word *bak*, in the sense of a wide open vessel, is very widely spread. We find it in Dutch, signifying a *trough* of any kind. In French, a *ferry-boat.* In Italian we have the diminutive *bacino*, a basin. With us, a *back* is the large wooden tun used by brewers. In Danish *bakke*, a tray; *bakke-bord*, a tray-shaped board (Molbech). Hence *bakke-bord-gammen*, or *bakke-gammen*, would signify the game of the tray, or tray-shaped board, an exact description of backgammon, although the writer is not aware whether the game is actually known by that name in Danish.

To Busk. Boun.—The primitive meaning of the Icelandic verb *at bua* seems to have been *to bend*, in the sense in which that word is used in such expressions as "to bend one's steps anywhither," "to bend the cannon against the enemy," viz. to exert power over an object to a definite end, to give it a certain direction—hence to prepare, to dress, to clothe.

It may be remarked that the Latin *paro* must have had the same original meaning, as appears from the compounds *separo*, to push things apart, to give each their own direction; *comparo*, to bring things together.

An example of the primitive meaning may be found in the expression "at bua sig," to betake oneself:—"Epter thetta *byr sig* Jarl sem skyndilegast or landi," After that the earl *betakes himself* with all haste out of the land. "Haralldur kongur *bist* austur um Eythascog," Harold the king *sets out* eastwards through the forest of Eida. Compare this with the meaning of *busk* in such cases as the following:—

> Many of the Danes privily were left,
> And *busked* westwards for to robbe eft.—R. Brunne in Jam.

They betook themselves westward.

Now it is admitted that the reciprocal form of the Icelandic verb in *st*, *at buast*, is a contraction for *at bua sig*, and must, like *truasc*, *fiasc*, in the För Skirnis, *barsc* in Heimskringla, at one time have sounded *at buasc*, leading us immediately to our equivalent, *to busk*.

We thus see the connexion between *busk* and *boun*, with which it is so frequently joined in our old ballad verse:—

> They *busked* & made them *boun*,
> Nas there no long abade.—Sir Tristrem in Jam.

Now *boun* is admitted to be merely the Icelandic participle of *bua*, *buinn*, prepared, addressed to a certain end, from whence the verb *to boun*, to make ready, to address oneself; the regular participle of which, *bouned*, is still in use, although somewhat disguised in form: "bound for London or New York," *i. e.* addressed, set in motion thitherward.

PEDIGREE.—From Icel. *Fedgar*, father and son collectively; *Lang-fedgar*, ancestors; *Lang-fedga-tal*, an enumeration of ancestors—a pedigree.

WANTON.—We are led to the true derivation by the ancient spelling *wantowen*.

> I wedded a wife well *wantowen* of manners.—P. P.

It seems to be the precise equivalent of the German *ungezogen*, ill-trained, ill-mannered, lewd, from the negative particle *wan*, corresponding to the German *un* (of which we see examples in the Old-Eng. *wan-hope*, despair; Ang.-Sax. *wan-hafa*, poor; *wan-scrydd*, ill-clothed; Dutch *wanvoeglyk*, unbecoming, and many others), and *getogen*, educated, from *teon*, to draw or lead, identical with the German *ziehen*.

KICKSHAWS.—Niceties; dishes suited to tempt the palate rather than for the solid satisfaction of hunger.

Certainly not from *quelque-chose*, but perhaps the Dutch may afford us a more probable etymology; for although at the present day the importation of a word from that source would be extremely unusual, yet it must be remembered that for a long period of our history the intercourse with the Low Countries was much more extensive. Now we find in Dutch, from *kiesen*, to choose, *kies*, *kiesch*, nice in eating; *kies-kawen*, to eat in a piddling, picking-and-choosing manner,—a word which might easily be corrupted into our *kickshaw*.

TO BURNISH.—Fr. *brunir*; derived, even by Ihre, from *brun*, brown, on the supposition that the denomination may have taken its rise at a period when arms were made of brass instead of iron. But *brown* would be as improper a designation of the colour of polished brass as iron, and almost universally implies dullness or absence of polish as well as mere colour.

The truth seems to be, that instead of deriving the Icel. and Swed.

bryna, to sharpen (whence *brynsten*, a whetstone), from the signification of *polishing*, we ought to consider the two ideas as related in the opposite order. In barbarous times the most obvious example of polished metal would be a newly-sharpened weapon, and from thence the designation might easily be transferred to the polishing of metallic surfaces in general.

Now *bryna*, in the sense of *sharpening* or *giving an edge* to an implement, might most naturally be derived from the Icel. *bryni*, Dan. *bryne*, an edge, in the same way that *eggia* (which like *bryna* is used, first in the sense of sharpening, and secondarily of exhorting) is from *egg*, an edge.

BONFIRE.—The guesses usually hazarded of *boon-fire*, quasi Fr. *bon-feu*, or *bæl-fire* from *bæl*, a funeral-pile, will not hold water for a moment. We find however in Danish the word *baun*, a beacon (probably identical with the 'fire-*bome* or beekne' of the Promptorium Parvulorum), and there cannot be an object from whence the designation of a *bon-fire* ("a fire voluntarily kindled as a token," as the word is explained by Richardson) might more naturally be drawn than a beacon-fire. It is probably from this source that the towns of Banbury and Banstead derive their names, which would thus be equivalent to Beacon-town and Beacon-place. There is close to Banstead a field containing a tumulus, still called the Beacon-field; and near Banbury a high conical hill called Crouch-hill, where the *crouch* or cross may probably have been erected on the site of the ancient beacon.

SELDOM.—Icel. *sialdan*, Germ. *selten*, quasi *sialf-dann*, *selb-getan*, made after its own fashion, singular, and hence (what is a less degree of singularity) rare.

Many examples of adjectives formed on the same termination may be seen in Ihre and Schmeller, under the heads Dann, and Tan, Getan respectively, from whence we may cite Swed. *så-dann*, Icel. *soddan*, Ang.-Sax. *so-þan*, Bavarian *sogetan*, *sog-tan*, *sotan*, *sottan*, *sotten*, so-formed, such; as showing the same degradation from the long accented *tan*, into an unaccented *ten*.

If the Scotch *seindill*, *seindle*, seldom, be (as there is little doubt) the equivalent of the Swed. *sina-ledes*, after its own fashion, from *sin*, suus, and *led*, via, it would be a strong corroboration of the foregoing explanation of *Seldom*.

With respect to the word *selb* itself, it is suggested by Grimm that it may be resolved into *sik-liba*, from *leiban*, to remain, that which remains in itself; but may not the second element consist of the word *leib*, body; as we find in Old Fr. the expression *ses cors* in the sense of him-self?—

> Et il *ses cors* ira avec vos en la terre de Babiloine.—Villehardouin, 46.

BUTTER.—We find in Schmeller (Baierisches Wort.) *buttern*, *butteln*, to shake backwards and forwards, to boult corn. *Butter-glass*, a ribbed glass for shaking up salad sauce. *Buttel trüb*, thick from shaking. *Butter-schmalz*, butter, *i. e.* grease produced by shaking backwards and forwards, by churning, as distinguished from *gelassene-schmalz*, grease that forms by merely standing.

Cheese.—Icel. *kæs* or *kös*, gen. *kasar*, a heap of moist things as fish, flesh, or the like. Hence *kasa*, to put such things in a heap in order to turn rancid, a process adopted in Iceland with respect to the flesh of seals (*havkalvekiöd*; Haldorsen), too coarse to be eatable fresh. *Kæstr*, incaseatus, having been subjected to this process; *kasadr*, subacidus, "veteris casei sapore," says the Icelandic lexicographer, who was doubtless acquainted with the taste of victuals so treated.

It is remarkable that *cheese* itself is known by a totally different name, *ost*; but the use of the word *kæsir*, rennet, shows their knowledge of the identity of the change taking place in cheese and in victuals treated in this unsavoury manner.

Fog.—The primitive sense of verbs formed on the syllable *fik* seems to consist in rapid variable movement. *Ficken, figken* (Schmeller), to make short alternating movements. So *fyke, fidge*, Sc.—*fidget*, Eng., nearly in the same sense. *Ficol*, Ang.-Sax., fickle, variable. *Fiuka*, Icel., to be carried about with the wind. *Fok*, light things so blown about. *Fiadra-fok*, a flight of feathers. Dan. *fyge*, to blow about; *fog*, that which is blown about; *snee-fog*, a snow-storm.

It appears then that the primitive meaning of our English *fog* consists in a reference to the drifting of the mist with the wind, just as we have *rack* or *wrack*, thin driving clouds, from *reka*, Icel., to drive; and it is probably the exemplification of the same phænomenon in another subject that has given the name of *Fog* in some counties to the long dead grass of the preceding summer that remains over the winter, blowing backwards and forwards with the wind.

Badger.—A corn-dealer; one who buys up corn in the market for the purpose of selling again; as well as the quadruped *Meles taxus*. Now we have in French *bladier*, a corn-dealer, the diminutive of which, according to the analogy of *blaier, blairie, blérie*, would be *blaireau*, the designation of the quadruped 'badger' in the same language, which would thus appear to signify a little corn-dealer; and the designations both in French and English would seem to point to some supposition respecting the habits of that animal, with which the general spread of cultivation has made us little familiar. But, further, it is probable that the English term is actually derived from the French *bladier*, the corrupt pronunciation of which, in analogy with *soldier, solger, sodger*, would be *bladger*; and though the omission of the *l* is rather an unusual change, yet instances may be given of synonyms differing only in the insertion or omission of an *l* after an initial *b* or *p*. Thus we have *botch* and *blotch* (Dutch *botsen* and *blutsen*), with nearly the same meanings; Dutch *baffen* or *blaffen*, to bark; *paveien* and *plaveien*, to pave; *pattyn* and *plattyn*, a skait or patten. The English *speak* compared with the German *sprechen* is nearly analogous.

2. "The Lapp and Finn tongues not unconnected with the Indo-European family." By T. Hewitt Key, Esq.

The aggregate of languages included in the so-called Indo-Teutonic family is gradually absorbing within its sphere more and more of those once deemed altogether foreign to it. No one now doubts the close affinity of the Celtic dialects to this family, and there seems good reason for the opinion that investigation alone is requisite to demonstrate that yet other tongues are fundamentally of the same origin. The object of the present paper is to establish the claim of the Lapp and Finn languages to admission into the family, and so to prove that the Tatar tongues, of which these are acknowledged to be a portion, are not justly set apart as altogether distinct from the great stock of languages which extend from the Ganges to the extremity of western Europe.

In the comparison of languages, relationship may be proved on the one hand by a similarity between the vocabularies; on the other by a similarity of what are called grammatical inflexions. But of these two tests the latter is by far the safer. The influence of conquest and the intercourse of commerce may be the means of introducing many new terms from one country to another, so as to produce the appearance of an affinity, when in fact that appearance belongs only to the surface, whereas the terminal syllables, which constitute the essential part of grammar, defy the dictations of conquerors, and perhaps never perish altogether but with the language itself. Secondly, in the vocabularies, the most trustworthy guides are the pronouns and numerals, and for the very same reason. But in truth, if a similarity in these respects be established between two tongues, it will, perhaps, always be found, that there is likewise a decided affinity in a considerable portion of the general vocabularies. In all these investigations however, the candid and intelligent explorer must remember that accident alone will account for some resemblances, seeing that languages contain so vast a number of objects to be compared. With this necessary caution, in a field of inquiry where much mischief and discredit has been caused by hasty inquiries and inductions, the attention of philologists is requested to the following evidence, as regards the languages of Finland and Lapland, which the present writer has deduced from the two grammars whose titles are given*, selecting these, because being written in Latin, they will be more generally intelligible to Englishmen than later and more complete grammars in Danish and Swedish.

A. Lapp Tongue.

The personal endings of the verb happen to exhibit a fuller development in the past tense than in the present, and therefore, brevity being an object, the former alone are here given. The essential part of the verb which signifies 'to change' is *molso* (Fiellström, p. 66), and the addition of an *i* constitutes the past tense, whose persons are as follow (p. 67):—

S. 1.	molsoib.	D. 1.	molsoimen.	P. 1.	molsoime.
2.	molsoi.	2.	molsoiten.	2.	molsoite.
3.	molsoi.	3.	molsoikan.	3.	molsoin.

---

* 'Grammatica Lapponica,' by Fiellström, Stockholm 1738. 'Grammatica Fennica,' by Vhael, Abo 1733.

The close connexion of the consonants *b* and *m* is well-known; and the German dative in *m*, as contrasted with the Latin in *bi*, exhibits an acknowledged interchange of these letters in a grammatical suffix; but in the present instance we need not look beyond the limits of Lapland for what we want, as the southern dialect of Lapland gives us *molsoim* in lieu of *molsoib* (p. 57).

The second and third person have lost all trace of personal suffixes, the obscurity which might thus be created being removed by the now universal practice of prefixing the personal pronouns, as in the other languages of modern Europe. In the dual these suffixes appear to the greatest advantage, and no one can fail to recognise in *molsoi-men* and *molsoi-ten* a similarity to the Greek suffixes of τυπτομεν and τυπτετον. The sole difficulty is, that the former of these two words is the property of the Greek plural, and not of the dual. To the present writer this is no unwelcome opposition, for he has elsewhere, long before he opened a Lapp grammar, put forward the doctrine that dual and plural suffixes are mere dialectic varieties of each other, often differing solely in the fact that the one has preferred a final *n*, the other a final *s*, both of which are ordinary suffixes of plurality, and probably are themselves intimately related, as no two letters are more liable to interchange. At other times the final consonant which denotes plurality (probably the *s* rather than the *n*), has been altogether discarded. Thus the Latin language has *scribitis* in the indicative and *scribite* in the imperative, where the distinction has been created altogether by an accident, for the imperative also must once have added the final consonant to denote the plural of the second person. The dual and plural therefore of the Lapp verb must be considered to be in origin but one, the plural having lost a letter which the dual has had the better fortune to retain.

Turning from the verbal inflexions to the personal pronouns in their independent form, we find (at p. 32)—

N. *mon*, I.	*todn*, thou.	*soden*, he.
G. *mo*, of me.	*to*, of thee.	*so*, of him.

in which again the initial elements bear a close similarity to those existing in the classical languages. Evidence of the same kind is to be seen in a peculiar construction with the possessive pronouns, which are attached as affixes to nouns (pp. 20, 21):—

parne, son;	*parnam*, my son.
nipe, knife;	*nipat*, thy knife.
aija, grandfather;	*aijabs*, his grandfather.

And here the mere nouns it is difficult to pass by without suspecting a possibility of connexion between them severally and the Scotch *bairn*, the English *knife*, and the Latin *avo* or Fr. diminutive *aieul*.

But to return to the verb. The gerundial form is *molso-man* (p. 58), and the imperfect participle is *molso-men* (p. 67): here again there is enough to remind one both of the old Greek infinitive *tuptemen* and the participle *tuptomenos*. The latter, it is true, is commonly used with a passive sense, but there is strong ground for believing that all participles in origin belong to the active voice. In the third place, attention may be directed to the formation of the Lapp passive. This, says our author, is made by adding to the active voice one invariable syllable, whose longest form is *tofwa* or *sofwa* (p. 63 &c.), but this is reduced to *tofw* or *sofw*, and even to *tou* or *sou* (p. 65 &c.). Now in the languages within the Indo-Teutonic range, perhaps it would be safe to add without exception, the only theory yet propounded teaches us that the passive is formed precisely in the same way, viz. the addition of a syllable denoting generally 'self.' Nor is it merely in the general principle of the passive formation that the agreement exists, for the Greek pronoun of this signification has for its essential portion *σφε*, and the Latin has *su* (*sui*, *suus*), both bearing a marked resemblance to the Lapp suffix.

Of the pronouns, those called personal and possessive have been considered. Besides these, we have something like the form we might hope to find (p. 41) in the interrogative *gå* and *gu*, N. *gu-tt*, and also in the relative *jue*, N. *jue-k*, and to these may be added *daa*, this.

Among the numerals too (p. 30, to say nothing of *ackt*, one, which is not unlike the Sanscrit) we have a startling similarity in the two forms for 'ten,' viz. *tzecke* compared with *δεκα* or *decem*, and *låcke*, which reminds one of the Lithuanian *lika*, which enters into the compound terms of that language from 'eleven' onwards to 'nineteen.' The appearance of *låcke* indeed seems to remove the only objection that can be made to Bopp's explanation of the terms 'eleven' and 'twelve,' when he makes the part. *leven* a dialectic variety of *decem* instead of a participle from *to leave*.

But perhaps the most extraordinary resemblance to a formation of the Indo-Teutonic family exists in the superlative (p. 22)—

ånek short, *ånekumus* shortest:

and what adds to the interest, the Lapp furnishes an explanation of this form which appears to be wanting elsewhere. It is a well-supported theory that superlatives are commonly formed through the comparative, much as the French *meilleur*, better, with the addition of an article becomes *le meilleur*, the best. The form of the Gothic superlative, and that one of the Greek language which ends in *ιστος*, clearly admit of a formation on this principle; but whence the Latin superlative, such as *postumus*, *optumus*? In the Lapp comparative the explanation appears to present itself:—

ånek short, *ånekub* shorter, *ånekumus* shortest.

It has already been seen in the first person of the indicative that the Lapps readily interchange a final *b* and final *m*, so that *ånekub* is fairly a mean between the positive and the superlative. It may be perhaps worth while to observe that the Lapp agrees with the rest of the Indo-Teutonic languages in forming comparatives and superlatives from prepositions.

The case-endings of nouns (p. 13), together with points of difference, have their points of resemblance also; and these so decided that they can scarcely be the result of accident.

The termination of the accusative is *m* or *b*, one more instance of the interchange before noticed. The suffix of the dative appears in two shapes, *s* and *i*, the latter of which agrees with the classical tongues. And even in the genitival suffix *en*, we have a termination far from unknown to the philologer. That a suffix commonly appearing as *is* should also take the form *n*, is *à priori* probable from the convertibility between these consonants; and in fact it is virtually seen in those plural genitives of the Sanscrit which end in *nam*, for the last two letters *am* serve only as the symbol of plurality, as they do in other parts of the Sanscrit noun. But the German also has its genitives in *en* in those words which are formed by the union of two nouns, where an *en* is interposed, as *kirchendieb*, *mondenlicht*, *hasenlager*, for this affix cannot here denote plurality; and its genitival power is confirmed by such forms as *rindsblase*, *rinderblase*, *landsknecht*.

To what has been stated it may be added, that other suffixes and prefixes also may be produced which support the same doctrine of affinity. Thus the Greek and Latin languages have their adjectives in *ικος* and *icus*, or striking off the nominatival ending, in *ico*; and the German has adjectives of a similar termination both in form and power, viz. *ig*, whence our English adjectives in *y*. Now the Lapp grammar (p. 25) places before us—

dackte bone, *dacktek* bony.
tiårfwe horn, *tiårfwek* horny.

So again there is a negative prefix of adjectives perfectly parallel to the Swedish, viz. *o* (p. 28). Indeed some have inferred from this very similarity, that it has been, in recent times, borrowed from the Swedish, but such a prefix seems to be an almost essential element of any language, and therefore not likely to be a recent importation from abroad. Nay, even in the ordinary negatives of the Swedish and Lapp tongues a similar resemblance prevails. The Swedish negative is *icke*, and the Lapp is commonly said to be represented by the vowel *i* alone (p. 69), but in the conjugation of the verb with a negative (p. 70) the letters *gg* are frequently attaching themselves to this *i*, if a vowel follow; so that we are justified in holding *igg* to be the fuller form of the negative.

It may perhaps be fitting to observe, that Bopp's theory of the Greek past tenses in *α*, *ετιθεα*, *ετυψα*, *τετυφα*, *ετετυφεα*, being formed by the addition of the particle called *α* privative (the idea of past, according to him, being a negation of the present), seems confirmed to some extent by the fact that the Lapps attach an *i*, which, as has been just said, is their ordinary negative, in the same way to form their past tenses.

B. Finn Language.

Much that has been said of the Lapp has its counterpart in the Finn.

The present of the verb *maxa*, loosen, is the following (p. 80): *maxan*, *maxat*, *maxaa*; *maxamme*, *maxatte*, *maxawat*. Here the first person, in imitation of the Greek *ετυπτον*, has substituted a final *n* for a final *m*, and the second person has the true suffix *t* of the second person, which is seen in the Latin pronoun *tu*, and in the suffixes of the Latin *ama-tis*, *amavis-ti*, *amavis-tis*, as well as in the English *art*, *wert*, *shalt*, &c. The first and second persons of the plural have a marked resemblance to the classical tongues. The gerund again resembles the Greek infinitives, for it has two forms, *maxa-in* and *maxa-mahan* (p. 83), severally corresponding to *τυπτειν* and *τυπτεμεν*. Then, as regards the personal pronouns, if we separate from the plural those parts which evidently denote case and number (p. 52 &c.), we arrive at the following form for the different persons—

me, *te*, *he*;

and the last is proved to be a corruption of *se*, first by the habit of this language like the Greek to substitute *h* for *s*. For instance, the nouns *wieras**, *kirwes*, *caunis*, form the genitives *wierahan*, *kirwehen*, *caunihin*; in which, by the way, the assimilation of the vowels in the suffix to the vowel in the base deserves attention, and it is only a single instance of a principle which characterises this language generally. But there is another proof that *he* is a corruption of *se*, and that is, that the singular actually has an *s*, viz. *se* (p. 52).

But to proceed: the essential portion of the simple demonstrative pronoun signifying 'this,' is *ta* or *tai*; that is, a word altogether identical with the Greek.

Again, if the interrogative or relative be in like manner divested of its suffixes for case and number, we have before us the syllable *cu* (p. 54), the very form of the Latin relative in *cuius*, *cui*, *cum*, &c. And this word at times appears as *ken*†, reminding one of the *ν* at the end of the Greek interrogative *τιν-ος τιν-α*, which is admitted to be closely related to the Latin *quis*, but differs from it in the sole point of assuming a *ν*.

Other forms of the demonstrative are *tama* and *se* (p. 52), which deserve attention for the fact that in the plural they exchange the initial *t* or *s* for an *n*, thus agreeing with the Pali (Bopp's V. G.), and also justifying that theory which makes the Latin *nam*, *num*, and the German *noch* of pronominal origin. Nor is it to be neglected, that *se* is in agreement with the use of the Greek *σημερον* for *τημερον* and our own adverb *so* and adjective *such*, which have also substituted an *s* for *t*.

The word *uter* of the Latin can be demonstrated to have been once possessed of an initial *c*, so as to have been *cuter*, the exact representative of the Herodotean *κοτερος*, and formed by adding to the relative the termination of a comparative, which is the appropriate suffix, because the very idea connected with it is a limitation to two objects. Now the Finn form which represents *uter* in meaning is *cumpi* (p. 48), and the Finn comparative ends in *mpi* (p. 29), as—

musta black, *mustempi* blacker.

Deduct then the termination which belongs to the comparative, and we have left the syllable *cu* as in *uter*, i. e. *cuter* itself.

---

* Compare the Greek *γενος*, gen. *γενεος*, for *γενεσος*.

† This form will be welcome to those who would deduce the relative and article from a demonstrative pronoun, and that again from a verb *ken*, signifying 'look.'

Among the numerals (p. 39) we have several striking similarities. In the first place, the term for 100 is precisely, letter for letter, the Sanscrit, viz. *sata*; and the word for 1000, *tuhat*, is evidently formed therefrom on the same analogy by which a German deduces his *tusund* from *hund*, the essential portion of *hundert* and *hundred*. That these four letters really constitute the main element of the German and English words is commonly admitted, and is confirmed by the relation between the English words *hate* and *hatred*. Between the formation of the Finn *tuhat* from *sata*, and the German *tusund* from *hund*, there is the slight discrepancy, that while they both adopt the very familiar interchange of *s* and *h*, the Finn maintains the sibilant in the shorter, the German in the longer form.

But there is yet another trace of a classical numeral. The ordinary word in Finn for 'ten' is *kommen*, but the form *dexan* is also found in the composition of the numerals, in such a manner that little doubt can exist about its power. In the series of cardinal numerals, occur *yxi* one, *caxi* two, *cahdexan* eight, and *yhdexan* nine, where it seems tolerably evident that the two larger numerals are formed by subtraction, 8 = 10 — 2, 9 = 10 — 1, precisely as in the Roman symbols IIX, IX. The Lapp numerals (p. 29) confirm this view, being—*ack-t* one, *qweck-t* two, *kacktze* eight, *åktze* nine, and *tzecke* ten. Indeed the same principle of formation is traceable in other Tatar languages, as the Aino* or Kurile: *syhnap* one, *dupk* two, *duhpyhs* eight, *syhnähpyhs* nine, and *upyhs* ten.

The suffixes by which distributives (p. 40) are formed in Finn bear evidence of a similar character, as they take the suffix *in*, thus agreeing with the Latin *bini*, *centeni*, &c. A still more striking agreement exists in the formation of diminutives from verbs: as, *lasken* dimitto, *laskelen* paulatim dimitto (pp. 60, 61). Compare herewith such Latin verbs as *ambul-o*, and such German as *wandel-n*, to say nothing of the marked resemblance of form in the roots of the Finn *lasken* and the German *lassen*.

As regards the vocabulary, a grammar is not the proper quarter in which search should be made for identity of forms, and it is not intended in the present paper to deal with the evidence of dictionaries. Still, even in the limited number of words which accident throws in one's way within the few pages of Vhael's grammar, there are many that deserve attention; nor need any allowance be made for the temptation to a philologer of selecting as his examples those words which bear an apparent connexion with other European tongues, for the philological writers of those days, so far as they were at all biassed by such feelings, sought everywhere and thought they found an affinity with the Hebrew, and Vhael himself exhibits this tendency (p. 60).

The Finn *joca* (p. 49) is stated to be formed by the affix of the particle *ca* to one of the forms of the relative, and in sense it is the equivalent of *quisque*. Now the Sanscrit has the relative in the form *ya*, and there cannot well be a stronger connexion than between the terminal syllables of the Finn *ca* and the Latin *que*.

---

* Ritter v. Xylander, Sprachgeschlecht der Titaner, pp. 445, 446.

But our limits will not admit of much more than an enumeration of forms deserving consideration.

wirsi,	ode,	p. 9,	(L. versus.)
mylli,	mola,	p. 17.	
paimen,	pastor,	p. 17,	(*ποιμην*.)
utar,	uber,	p. 22,	(*ουθαρ*, L. uter.)
kÿtos,	laus,	p. 22,	(*κυδος*.)
wieres,	hospes,	p. 23,	(G. wirth.)
siemen,	semen,	p. 24.	
moni,	multus,	p. 30,	(many.)
wesi,	aqua,	p. 31,	(G. wass-er, &c.)
carwa,	pilus,	p. 31,	(Sanscr. kar.)
cuningas,	rex,	p. 32,	(G. köning.)
wähä,	parvus,	p. 32,	(wee.)
suotiu-sa,	suavis,	p. 34,	(sweet, &c.)
sokia,	coecus,	p. 35.	
paino,	pondus,	p. 35.	
pistin,	pistillum,	p. 37.	
paha,	malus,	p. 63,	(pejor.)
wapa,	virga,	p. 63,	(weapon.)
putoa-n,	cado,	p. 67,	(*πι-πετ-ω ποτ-μος*.)
repia-n,	rumpor,	p. 67.	
outo,	peregrinum,	p. 68,	(out, outer.)

As grain is with difficulty produced in any parts of Lapland and Finland or Finmark, it will not be safe to rely on such words as ***mylli*** mola, or ***siemen*** semen; but on the other hand, pasturage being essential to the existence of the people, it is in the same proportion unlikely that a term for 'shepherd' should have been wanting in the earliest stage of the language. Indeed it is more likely that the Greeks should have derived their term *ποιμην* from the North than that they should have exported it. In the Greek tongue the word admits of no complete analysis. We have, it is true, an explanation of the first syllable in the Greek *πῶν* as well as in the Latin *pecus*, Gothic *faihu*, German *vieh*, &c., but for the second syllable we must have recourse to the Teutonic *mann*, so that the word would signify 'herdsman.'

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. JANUARY 30, 1846. No. 41.

DANIEL SHARPE, Esq., in the Chair.

There was laid on the table—
"Forby's Vocabulary of East Anglia," with MS. Annotations. Presented by R. Bevan, Esq. of Bury.

Tom Taylor, Esq., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor of English Literature, University College, London, was elected a Member of the Society.

A paper was then read:—

"On the Anomalies of the English Verb arising from the Letter-changes." By Edwin Guest, Esq.

In a former number[*] we considered the peculiarities of those verbs whose forms departed altogether from the scheme of our ordinary conjugations; in the present paper we shall examine the anomalies which arise, not from any essential difference of structure, but solely from the effect of certain letter-changes.

In some of our Old-English MSS. we find *th* changed to *t*, whenever it follows in the same sentence a word ending in *d* or *t*. This curious law is followed throughout the Ormulum, in the Saxon Chronicle from 1132 to 1140, and in the lives of St. Catharine, St. Margaret, and St. Juliane. The Ormulum and the portions of the Chronicle referred to were probably written in one of our eastern counties, and the three works last mentioned in some county north of Trent. The east-of-England phrase "now and *tan*," and such northern phrases as "houd *teh* tongue," "I know not what *to* means," are clearly relics of this very singular letter-change.

Now in many of the Anglo-Saxon and Old-English verbs, the inflexions *st*, *th*, were affixed at once to the verbal base, without any intervening element, as *comst*, *comþ*. When the base ended in *d* or *t*, the inflexion þ appears to have become *t*, according to the law just enunciated, and the inconvenient combinations *dt*, *tt*, were replaced by a single *t*. The peculiar form of the third person which resulted from these letter-changes was used as late as the fifteenth century.

1. The see goth hym (England) al aboute, he *stont* (standeth)
as an yle.— R. Glou. 1.

2. Goth forth to Via Appia quod she,
That fro this toun ne *stant* but miles three.
Ch. Second Nonnes Tale, 172.

---

[*] No. 38.

3. He turneth the cradel, and *fint* the child quik.
Sevyn Sages, 821.

4. The messanger goth and hath nought forgete
And *fint* the knight at his mete. Lay le Freine, 44.

5. Valerian goth home and *fint* Cecilie.
Ch. Second Nonnes Tale, 218.

6. Whoso first cometh to the mill, first *grint*.
Ch. W. of Bathes Prol. 388.

7. He ys most prest paiere. þat any pouere man knoweþ.
He *with halt* not hiwe hus hyre overe even. Vis de P. Pl. pass. 8.

8. Þe kyng, he seide of Engelond *halt* hym to hys bedde
And lyþ myd hys gret wombe at Reyns a child-bedde.
R. Glou. 379.

9. Whan that our pot is broke, as I have sayde,
Every man *chit* and *holt* him evil apayde.
Ch. The Chan. Yemannes Tale, 212.

10. — he is here and there
He is so variaunt, he *abit* no wher.
Ch. The Chan. Yemannes Tale, 466.

11. We mowen not, although we had it sworn
It overtake, it *slit* away so fast. Ch. Chan. Yem. Prol. 129.

12. Besyhed care and sorowe
Is with mony uche a morowe
Som for seknesse and some for smerte
Som for defaute other poverte
Som for the lyves drede
That *glyt* away as flour in mede. Kyng Alis. 8.

13. What shulde he studie, and make himselven wood
Upon a book in cloistre alway to pore,
Or swinken with his hondes and laboure
As Austin *bit*. Chau. Prol. 185.

14. And Salomon for a womanis love
Forsok his God that *syt* above. Kyng Alis. 7715.

15. The leon *sit* in his awaite alway
To sle the innocent. Ch. Freres Tale, 357.

16. But God that *sit* in heuen aboue alone
Knowing his herte, &c. Hardyng, Chron. 372. 5.

In other Old-English MSS.*, *th* is changed to *t*, not only when it follows words ending in *d* or *t*, but also when it follows words ending in *s*. The usage which gave rise to this law may still be traced in some of our northern dialects.

17. Good lad, sed I, boh heaw far 's *tis* Littleborough off?—seys *t'* lad its obeawt a mile, &c. So I powlert o'er yetes and steels till eh coom to *this* Littleborough, &c.—Tim Bobbin, 4.

In accordance with this letter-change, we find the inflexion *th* represented by *t*, when attached immediately to a verbal base ending in *s*.

---

* See the Legend of St. Catharine and the Institutio Monialium, Titus, D. 18.

18. Mid ivi grene al be growe
That ever stont iliche i-blowe,
An his hou never ne *vorlost*
Wan hit snuith ne wan hit *frost.*

With ivy green all overgrown—
That ever standeth alike blooming,
And its colour never looseth
When it snoweth, nor when it freeseth. Hule and Niȝtingale, 618.

19. Wan men carpen of Cryst. oþ^{r} of clennesse of soule
He *wext* (waxeth) wroþ & wol not huyre. bote wordes of murthe
Penaunce and pour men. the passion of seyntes
He hateþ to huyre of. Vis. de P. Pl. pass. 8. Whit. ed.

20. A tunne whan his lie *arist* (ariseth)
Tobreketh. Gower, Conf. Am. 1.

21. Whan that the firste cock hath crowe, anon
Up *rist* this jolly lover Absolon
And him arrayeth gay. Ch. Milleres Tale, 503.

Writers who have flourished during the last two or three centuries have generally mistaken the nature of this inflexion; Spenser uses *uprist* as a past participle, and Coleridge as a preterite!

22. Flora now calleth forth each flower
And bids make ready Maia's bower
That new is *uprist* (uprisen) from bed. Spenser, March.

23. Nor dim, nor red, like God's own head,
The glorious sun *uprist* (uprose),
Then all averr'd I had kill'd the bird
That brought the fog and mist.
'T was right, they said, &c. Ancient Mariner, part 2.

The northern men seem at all times to have been peculiarly liable to blunders of this kind, inasmuch as the *th*, represented by the final *t*, was properly an inflexion of our southern dialect, and but rarely used in the north of England or in Scotland. It would seem from the following passage, that King James, notwithstanding his many years' residence at Windsor, supposed that *abit* and *abyde* might be used indifferently.

24. All thing has tyme—thus sais Ecclesiaste—
And wele is him, that his tyme will *abit.*
Abyde thy tyme; for he that can bot haste
Can not of hap, the wise man it writ,
And oft gud fortune floureth more than wit.
James I. King's Quhair, 109.

Gawin Douglas also uses *stant* in the first person of the present tense.

25. Of Mantua am I beget and boir,
In Calabre decessit and forloir;
Now *stant* I grave in Naplys the cyte,
That in my tyme wrait natabyll warkis thre.

The reader will feel no surprise at seeing *rit, rist,* &c. represented as preterites in our modern glossaries.

In investigating the conjugation of the anomalous verb *wot*[*], we

---

[*] See No. 38. p. 159.

found the *t* disappearing in the second person singular—*wost*. This is merely one example of a rule, which once prevailed very widely in our language, and whose influence has not yet disappeared from our provincial dialects. When the inflexion *st* was added immediately to a verbal root ending in *d* or *t*, these final letters were elided.

26. Ah ȝet thu fule thing me *chist*
And wel grimliche me *atwist*.

But yet, thou foul thing, thou me chidest
And full fiercely thou me twittest. Hule and Niȝtingale, 1330.

27. Tho hadde the Soudan wonder mest
And seyde, " Palmer ryghtly thou *arest* (aread'st, *i. e.* tellest)
Al the maner." Oct. 1425.

28. Icham Swythyn wan þou *byst*.
I am Swythyn whom thou biddest (*i. e.* prayest to). R. Glou. 337.

29. Louerd he seyde Þat ech þyng madest queynte and sley
And changest poer and kynedoms al at thy nowe rede
And monnes sones wreche *senst* (send'st) of her fader mysdede, &c.
R. Glou. 350.

30. I ne wende noȝt that eny man my dunte ssolde at stonde
Ac þou *at stonst* (at-stand'st) yt noȝt one, ac art al clene aboue.
R. Glou. 309.

31. In evil hour thou *henst* (hent'st, *i. e.* takest) in hand
Thus holy hills to blame. Spens. July.

32. Syre byssop wy ne gyfst us of þyne wyte brede
That þou *est* (eat'st) þe self at þy messe. R. Glou. 238.

The preterites ending in *de* formed the second person singular in *dest*. But in a few cases the *e* was lost as early as the fourteenth century, and the *d* being thus brought into contact with the *st*, was elided as in the preceding examples—*diddest, did'st, di'st*.

33. Þo þou versoke such travail, to be in God seruise
And wraþþedest so much God, þou ne *dust* (didst) noȝt as þe wise.
R. Glou. 428.

34. An thee behine or at my zyde
Di'st skep, &c. Barnes, Dorsetsh. Dial. p. 232.

The *l* of *would, should,* was also dropt in pronunciation in the fourteenth century; and by a similar process of elision, we have for the second person singular the mutilated forms *wost, shost*—forms which are still in familiar use among our English yeomanry.

35. — ich clepude þe so vp, þat þou *shost* yse
To nyme an saumple afterward mylfol & mek to be. R. Glou. 435.

36. — ych was y suore to hym ar to þe
And gyf ich adde hym besuyke þe wors þou *wost* leue me.
R. Glou. 272.

37. My levedi me sent the tille
For ich am prive
And praieth the with wille
That thou *wost* her se. Tristr. 2. 87.

38. Quhat *wostow* than? sum bird may cum and stryue
In song with the. James I. King's Quhair, 40.

39. The time wull come when thou *wust* gie
The wordle var to have 'er smile. Barnes, Dors. Dial. p. 239.

Generally the verbs of our southern English formed their preterites by adding *de*, and their past participles by adding *d* to the verbal base, and these inflexions were added either immediately or with the aid of an intervening element. When the verbal base ended in a hard or whisper letter, and *de*, *d* were added to it immediately, these suffixes became respectively *te*, *t*, according to the law which forbids the juxtaposition of vocal and whisper letters.

When the verbal base ends in *d* or *t*, we rarely find more than one *d* or *t* in the preterite, unless the spelling require the two letters in order to indicate the shortness of the preceding vowel, as *fedde*, *betidde*, *mette*, &c.

40. — another stroke he hym *brayde*[*]
Hys mase upon hys hed he layde. R. Cœur de Lion, 411.

41. He thoght hymself as worthi as hym that hym made,
In brightness, in bewty; therfor he hym *degrade*, &c.
Townley, Myst. 20.

42. In to þe lond of Grece he *wende* & þo wonede he þere. R. Glou. 11.

43. — where late she *wend*
To comfort her weak limbs in cooling flood.
Fairfax, Tasso, 6. 109.

44. Þe kyng of Fraunce aftur folc wide aboute *sende*
To awreke hym of þe luþer men þat ys frend so *schende*. R. Gl. 36.

45. Þe maister of the messageres, Imberd was ys name
Bende ys bowe & shette anon, &c. R. Glou. 16.

46. And ful fast thai slogh and *brend*. Minot, p. 10.

47. He *cumand* than that men suld fare
Til Ingland and for nothing spare
Bot brin and sla. Minot, p. 10.

48. To that ilk lokyng boþe þei *consent*
In luf þei departed, Hardknout home went. R. Br. 52.

49. Loth him was that dede to do
Ac atte last he *graunt* therto. Lay Le Freine, 318.

0. Þorgh þe grace of God, Gunter turned his wille
Cristend wild he be, þe kyng of fonte him *lift*
& þritty of his knyghtes turnes þorgh Godes gift. R. Br. 25.

51. Þys bataile *ylaste* þus from a morwe vorte non. R. Glou. 398.

52. Every second or thridde day she *fast*
Ay bidding in hire orisons ful fast. Ch. Second Nonnes Tale, 139.

53. O mother maid—
That ravishedest doun fro the deitee
Thurgh thin humblesse, the gost that in thee *alight*.
Ch. The Prioresses Tale, 18.

54. The porter of the abbay rose—
Rong the belles and taperes *light*,
Leyd forth bokes, and al redi *dight*. Lay Le Freine, 181.

In MSS. written during the fifteenth, or at the close of the four-

---

[*] "To *brayd* a stroke," means to fetch a stroke.

teenth century, the final *e* was very often omitted; hence we find the verbs mutilated in ex. 43, 46, 47, 48, &c.

The past participles also rarely take more than a single *d* or *t*.

55. Thou shuld have *bide*[*] til thou were cald. Townl. Myst. 9.

56. O my lorde of Yorke God hath *prouyde*[*]
In this for you. Hardyng's Chron. Proheme.

57. By whose aduyse all other rightes *exclude*[*]
The kyng iudged to John Bailyol the croune
That was discent as clearly was *conclude*[*]
Of theldest doughter of Dauyd Huntyngdon.
Hard. Chron. c. 159.

58. — these black masks
Proclaim an *enshield* beauty ten times louder
Than beauty could display'd. M. for M. 2. 4.

59. They drew aback as half with shame *confound*. Spens. July.

60. But now (thanked be God therfor)
The world is well *amend*. Spens. June.

61. Good is no good, but if it be *spend*
God giveth good for non other end. Spens. May.

62. — hastit forth thar way,
As the rod led thame, quhil *ascend* ar thai
The hill. G. Douglas, Eneid. 1. c. vii.

63. O hie princess quham to Jupiter has *grant*
To beld ane new cyte. G. Dougl. En. 1. c. viii.

64. — the kyngly gyftis scheyn
Quilkis suld be *present* to the ryall queyn.
G. Dougl. En. 1. c. xi.

65. To bataille haf thei *mynt*[†] Harald & William. R. Br. 71.

66. — ful oft
There as I *mynt* full sore I smyte but soft.
James I. King's Quhair.

67. — a braver choice of dauntless spirits
Than now the English bottoms have *waft* o'er
Did never float upon the swelling tide. K. John, 2. 1.

68. With head *uplift* above the wave, and eyes
That sparkling blazed. P. L. 1. 193.

69. But now from me his madding mind is *start*
And woes the widdows daughter of the Glenne. Spens. April.

70. — he spake & commanded that they should heat the furnace one seven times more than it was wont to be *heat*.—Dan. 3.

71. The element itself till seven years *heat*
Shall not behold her face. Twelfth Night, 1. 1.

72. Courageous Richmond, well hast thou *acquit* thee. R. III. 5. 4.

Het (Car spells it *hette*) is still used in Craven. In the modern editions of our Bible, *heat*, ex. 70, has been changed to *heated*. Todd must have overlooked this fact, when he accused Johnson of having

---

[*] The final *e* in *bide*, *provyde*, *exclude*, *conclude*, is no essential part of the word, but merely added, according to the orthography of the fifteenth century, to show that the preceding vowel is a long one.

[†] *To mint*, to aim at, to attempt.—Forby, Brockett.

"unwarrantably printed the word *heated*"; Johnson merely used one of the later editions.

We have said that the proper endings of the preterite and past participle were, in our southern dialect, *de, d*; and that *te, t,* were substituted for these endings only when they were affixed immediately to a verbal base, terminating in a hard or whisper letter. But in some Gothic dialects *te, t,* were the proper endings in all cases; and in other Gothic dialects they were used occasionally when the verbal base ended in a nasal or liquid, or some combination of a nasal or liquid. This partial adoption of the *t* appears to have prevailed in some of our northern dialects, from which our modern English has borrowed it in the case of certain verbs ending in *l, m, n, ld, rd, nd,* and *v*; as *dealt, felt, dwelt, spelt, smelt, spilt, dreamt, leant, meant, learnt, burnt, built, gilt, girt, spent, sent, bent, rent, reft, cleft, left*. In our northern MSS., and also in some of the dialects still spoken in the north of England, we find this inflexion affixed to verbs which do not tolerate it in the written language of the present day.

73. Then James Douglas seeing the king in his bed, *wint* (weened)* that all had been sicker enough and past in like manner to his bed.—Pitscottie, p. 140.

74. Or it wer alle *ent* (ended) þe worke þat þei did wirke
Þei ordeynd a couent to ministre in þat kirke. R. Br. 80.

75. — at ȝour jugement I will stand and do
With þi þat it be *ent* the strif bituex vs tuo. R. Br. 86.

76. Rimenild hire *biwente* and Athelbrus fule heo schente.
Rimenild turned her round & foully Athelbrus she shent.
Child Horn. Cambr. MS.

77. — John Balyol—
That was *discent* as clearly was conclude
From theldest daughter of Dauyd Huntyngdon.
Hard. Chron. 159.

78. Now liest thou of life and honour reft—
Ne can thy irrevocable destiny be *weft* (waved). F. Q. 3. 4. 36.

79. The Soudan that *left* (believed) in Termagaunt, &c.
Octovian, 919.

But in certain of our northern dialects, particularly in those spoken north of the Tweed, the *t* appears to have entered *generally* into the formation of the preterite and past participle, even when the ending was not added immediately to the base, as *belevit, consailit, ordainit, mingit, kepit,* &c. We might explain this peculiarity by assuming that these northern dialects, like the modern German, used *te, t,* instead of the southern inflexions *de, d*; but it will admit also another explanation, which may not be altogether unworthy of the reader's notice.

When the Anglo-Saxon participle entered into construction with the verb *have*, it sometimes agreed in case and gender with the object

---

* Or was there a North-of-England verb to *wint*, answering to the Danish *vente*, to expect? In that case *wint* would stand for *winte*, i. e. *wint-te*. See ex. 49, 50, 51, &c.

of the verb, the syntax resembling that of the Latin phrase "adolescentiam nostram habent *despicatam*." But more generally the participle was put in the neuter gender, as if in the preceding example Terence had written "despicatum," and instead of "they have my youth in contempt," the sentence had taken the turn "they have my youth *as a despised thing*." Now in the Anglo-Saxon, the past participle took no inflexion or distinctive ending, either in the nominative or accusative of the neuter gender, so that the construction "he hath hated me," would suit either the present or the earlier stage of our language, *hated* being considered as the participle in the accusative case and neuter gender. But in the Norse dialects the participle, whether it ended in *n* or *d*, did take a particular ending in the neuter; and the Swedish *hatad* hated, *värmd* warmed, &c. became in that gender *hatadt*, *värmdt*, &c., just as in English the neuters *what*, *that*, *hit* (now written *it*) were formed from *who*, *the*, *he*. These Swedish participles are said to belong to the passive voice, and are used in construction with the verb substantive. The phrases "he is hated," "it is hated," would require—the first the masculine form *hatad*, and the second the neuter form *hatadt*. But for the past participle of the active voice another form is used; and in the phrases "I have hated him, or her, or it," the participle *hated* would be represented by the Swedish *hatat*. As *hatat* and *hatadt* are pronounced alike, modern grammarians have with much reason declared them to be identical, and that the Swedish active participle is nothing more than the passive participle in the neuter gender. In Danish, the distinction between the active and passive participles does not exist (at least in that class of verbs which form their participles in *d* or *t*), inasmuch as the Danish past participle ends in *t*, whether used actively or passively, or whether the past tense ends in *te* or *de*; thus *lægge* to lay, *smöre* to smear, *flye* to fly, &c., have for their past tenses *lægde*, *smurde*, *flyede*, &c., but for their participles *lagt*, *smurt*, *flyet*, &c. Now it is possible that this adoption of the *t* may have arisen from the frequent use of the neuter participle; and if this hypothesis apply to the Danish, it will also explain the terminations found in our northern dialect: we have only to suppose that the preterites in *de* gradually disappeared before that love of uniformity, which always exercises so great a power in language. *If* the hypothesis here advanced be a true one, we have in the past participles of our northern dialects the most singular relic of his language which the Northman has left behind him. The history however of these dialects has been as yet too imperfectly traced out, for the writer of this paper to venture any decided opinion upon a question so obscure and difficult.

Verbs which form the participle in *n*, often substituted *e* for the final *en*. We call the *e* a substitution for, rather than a corruption of, the *en*, because the nature of this latter ending has not yet been ascertained, and its form seems to depend on principles which have hardly as yet been made the subject of investigation. Participles with the vowel-termination are not unknown to our Anglo-Saxon MSS., and in the Old-English they are found in such numbers, as to suggest a doubt whether the usual form of the past participle was not, even in the Anglo-Saxon times, characteristic of the written rather than of the spoken language. In modern English the final *e* has of course disappeared, but with this mutilation many of the Old-English participles in *e* have come down to us. They generally belong to verbal bases ending in *d* or *t*, as *bid, hid, rid, bound, ground, found, bit, hit, writ, got*, &c.; or to bases ending in *n, ng, nk*, as *won, run, spun, begun, hung, sung, wrung, slung, stung, sunk, shrunk, drunk*, &c.; that is, they belong to verbal bases which allow of a form bearing a close analogy to the ordinary participles in *d, t*, or *n*. There are a few modern participles which do not come under this rule, as *swum, stuck, struck*, &c., but the exceptions are much fewer than might have been expected when we remember the vast number of Old-English participles which ended in *e*.

80. —þe noble tour
Þat of alle the tours of Engelond ys *yholde* flour. R. Glou. 433.

81. — in that lond, as tellen knightes old,
Ther is som mete that is ful deintee *hold*[*].
Ch. The Squieres Tale, 62.

82. Þo Silui hadde *bi gete* a child, fayn he wolde wyte
What mon þat child schulde be þat he hadde *y gete*. R. Glou. 10.

83. Hast þou *for ȝete* þe gret wo, and þe mony harde wonde
Þat ich habbe yþoled, &c. R. Glou. 24.

84. The messanger goth and hath nought *forgete*
And fint the knight at his mete. Lay Le Freine, 44.

85. — the yonge sonne
Hath in the ram his halfe cours *yronne*. Ch. Prol. 8.

86. — thou hast now *forsake*
My doȝter þat schulde be þi wif & to a kemelyng *take*.
R. Glou. 25.

87. He sterueth ate ferste word
That we schal in court speke!
Thanne he wil of ous be *wreke*. Sevyn Sages, 350.

88. — whan they han a certain purpos *take*
They can not stint of hir intention. Ch. The Clerkes Tale, 93.

89. Now is me *shape* eternally to dwelle
Not only in purgatorie, but in helle. Ch. The Knightes Tale, 368.

90. — sondry folk, by aventure *yfalle*
In felawship and pilgrimes were they alle. Ch. Prol. 25.

91. Than seyd Clement " he schall be *stole*
With some queyntys"
And bad that counsell schuld be *hole*
Stylle in Paris. Oct. 1353.

92. When you have penetrated hills like air,
Div'd to the bottom of the sea like lead,
And *risse* again like cork. B. Jons. The Fortunate Isles.

---

[*] Chaucer certainly wrote *holde* and just as certainly *olde*, the plural adjective agreeing with *knightes*.

93. Hengist faire hym þonkede, and hys hed lowtede a doun,
“þou hast, he seide, *geue* me mony a fayr town,” &c.
R. Glou. 115.

94. — unto a poure ordre for to give
Is signe that a man is wel *yshrive*. Ch. Prol. 226.

95. The bestes were *dryue* hem fro
Ryght hastyly. Oct. 714.

96. Duk Perithous loved wel Arcite
And had him *knowe* at Thebes. Ch. The Knightes Tale, 345.

97. And whanne men of that place hadden *knowe* him, thei senten, &c. —Wiclif, Matthew, 14.

98. For hardily she was not *undergrowe*. Ch. Prol. 156.

99. He alizte with *drawe* swerd. R. Glou. 536.

100. — as he wer wod he ferd
He ran with a *drawe* swerd
To his Mamentrye. Oct. 1305.

101. This is a devyl and no man,
That has my stronge lyonn *slawe*,
The herte out of his body *drawe*
And has it eeten, &c. R. C. de Lion, 1107.

102. Tho Octouian vnderstode
His beste *yslawe*, he wax all wod. Oct. 1625.

103. þe tything to Rome com, þat he *y slawe* was. R. Glou. 83.

104. — God geve the euell fall
Thou scholdyst be honged or *hewe* small. Oct. 213.

105. Mi wif he wolde haue *forlai*,
Therfore ye schulle al dai. Sevyn Sages, 1706.

106. — Chesturschire and Derbyschire also,
And Stafford schire, þat beþ alle in on bischopriche *ydo*.
R. Glou. 4.

107. — a thefe
That many a trewe man hath *do* mischefe.
Ch. The Knightes Tale, 468.

108. And he seide to hem an enemy hath *do* this, &c.—Wicl. Matt. 13.

109. — the peple wondride and seide, it hath not *be* seen thus in Israel. —Wicl. Matt. 9.

110. In Gernade at the sege eke had he *be*
Of Algesir, and ridden in Barbarie. Ch. Prol. 56.

In cases where, as in the last few examples, the base ended in a vowel, the final *e* was often absorbed, and that too at a very early period of our language.

When in the fifteenth century the final *e* was lost, there was often great danger of confounding these participles with their preterites. In some cases this confusion has certainly taken place; and authors of high reputation have not unfrequently used the preterite for the participle, and the participle for the preterite. No authority can sanction so barbarous a solecism. But in passing judgment in these cases, we must be careful not to take the modern usage of our language as our only guide. Many verbs followed different analogies in different dialects: *gete*, ex. 82; *wreke*, ex. 87; *slawe*, ex. 102, &c., point to participles such as *geten*, *wreken*, *slawen*, &c., though the only participles which have survived in modern usage take a different form, *gotten*, *wrocken*, *slain*, &c.

In the cases we have considered, the inflexion of the verb has been the subject of the letter-change; we shall now give some examples in which the verbal base has been affected by it.

When the aspirate *gh* immediately preceded *s* in the Old-English dialect, an *x* was the result; thus from *high'st* came the Old-English *hext*, and our Modern-English *next* was formed in the same way from *nigh'st*. When a verb, in which this aspirate was latent, as *to see*, *to lye*, took the inflexion of the second person singular, the resulting form ended in *xt*.

111. Dame, he seide, no *sixt* þou wel, that les yt ys al þis. R. Glou. 160.

112. — Wille slepest þou, *syxt* þow þis puple
How busy þai ben, &c. P. Pl. pass. 2. Whit. ed.

113. Thanne saide the maistres to Florentyn
What *sextou* leue child tharin. Sevyn Sages, 362.

114. "Out traitour of mi land,"
Tristrem spac that tide
"Thou *lext*," &c. Tristr. 1. 79.

115. — disputen—
Till "thou *luxt*" and "thou *luxt*" be lady over hem alle
And thenne a wake ich Wrathe. P. Pl. pass. 7.

When the verbal base ends in *k* or its modern representative *ch*, *k* or *ch* was often changed to the aspirate *gh* (in the older MSS. ȝ) before the inflexions of the preterite and participle.

116. A doun mid so gret eir to þe erþe he fel and *piȝte* (pitched).
R. Glou. 29.

117. — tents
Thus proudly *pight* upon our Phrygian plains. Tr. and Cr. 5. 11.

118. With gaudy girlonds or fresh flourets dight
About her neck, or rings of rushes *plight* (pleach'd)*. F. Q. 2. 6. 7.

119. And ever in on alway she cried and *shright* (shriek'd)
And with hire bek here selven she so *twight* (twitched), &c.
Ch. Squieres Tale, 409.

Gh sometimes represents a *g*, which in the other tenses of the verb is latent—*tie*, pret. *tight*.

120. And thereunto a great long chain he *tight*,
With which he drew him forth e'en in his own despite.
F. Q. 6. 12. 34.

For the most part when the final vowel was thus changed to *gh*, there was also a change in the radical vowel from a narrow to a broad one. This change of the vowel is so important a modification of the verbal base, as hardly to fall within the scope of the present paper. It may however be convenient to notice a few examples. The

---

* *Plight* may be considered either as the participle of *pleach*, or as the participle of *plight*, to weave: see ex. 63, &c. It is probable however that Spenser, fond as he was of our older language, connected it with the former of these verbs.

preterites *sought, caught, taught, besought, bought, brought, thought,* are still familiarly used in our standard English. In the Old-English are other examples,—*betaught,* the preterite of *betake,* to give, *rought* (reck'd), *raught* (reached), *straught* (stretch'd), *faught* (fetched), &c.

121. — love when he *betaught* her me
Said that hope wher so I go
Shuld aie be relese of my wo. Rom. of the Rose, 4438.

122. Thai no *rought* (reck'd not) of his fare. Tristr. 2. 1.

123. Until she *raught* the gods own mansions. Sp. Visions of Bellay.

124. The auld guid man *raught* down the pock. Burns's Halloween.

125. — I would have *faught* (fetched) a walk with you.
Congreve, Way of the World, 4. 4.

126. Thanne he seide to the man, stretche forth thin hond and he *straughte* forth, &c.—Wiclif, Matt. 12.

The final consonant of the base is subject to various changes in the preterites of those verbs which form their participles in *n*. Certain Danish verbs ending in *ld, nd,* change the *d* into *t*: thus *holde* to hold, *gjælde* to be valid, *finde* to find, *binde* to bind, &c., have for their preterites *holdt, gjaldt, fandt, bandt,* &c.; and the same letter-change seems to have been known to some of our Old-English dialects.

127. His baner upon the wall he pulte,
Many a gryffon it *byhulte* (beheld). R. C. de Lion, 1921.

128. Ne once did yield it respit day or night,
But soon as Titan gan his head exault,
And soon again as he his light *withault* (withheld)
Their wicked engins they against it bent. F. Q. 2. 11. 9.

129. Lo Adam in the feld of Damascene
With Goddes owen finger wrought was he—
And *welte* (wielded, *i. e.* ruled) all paradis saving o tree.
Ch. Monkes Tale, 20.

The Anglo-Saxon *wealdan,* to govern, has for its past tense *weold,* which by virtue of this letter-change becomes *welt.* The final *e* in *behulte, welte,* ex. 127, 129, is no doubt a blunder either of the transcriber of the MS. or of its editor. Care must be taken not to confound this final *t* with the inflexion *t* in *holt,* holdeth, ex. 8, 9, *welt,* wieldeth, &c., or with the inflexion *te* (often corrupted into *t*), by which so many of our preterites were formed. See ex. 76, &c.

Many words ending in a hard or whisper letter changed it to the corresponding vocal letter when they took an inflexion opening with a vowel: thus *wif, half, thief,* &c. formed in the plural *wiv-es, halv-es, thiev-es,* &c. In like manner Old-English verbs whose preterites ended in *f* changed *f* to *v* before an inflexion of this kind—sing. *gaf,* plural *gaven* or *gave.* As the Anglo-Saxons had no *v*, they had no means of indicating the letter-change, but in all probability the *f* was pronounced as a vocal letter when the inflexion was added. In the Old-English, the difference in the spelling makes the letter-change at once apparent.

130. — to oon he *gaf* fyve talentis, to an othir tweyne, &c. Thanne the kyng schal seye, &c. Come ye the blessid of my fadir, &c. For I hungride and ye *gaven* me to ete, &c.—Wiclif, Matt. 25.

131. I —hadde nede to write to you, and preie to *stryve* strongly for the feith, &c. Whanne myghel archangel disputide with the devel and *stroof* of moses bodi, he was not hardy to bryng, &c.—Wiclif, Judas 1.

132. — with the rose colour *strof* here hewe.
Ch. Knightes Tale, 180.

133. Alas Custance, thou hast no champioun
But he that *starf* (died) for our redemption.
Ch. M. of Lawes Tale, 621.

134. For which anon they *storven* bothe two.
Ch. The Pardoneres Tale, 530.

135. Let *delue* vnder the fundement & thou schalt be nethe fynde
A water pol, that hath ymad that this werk ys be hynde—
Me *dalf* be nethe, &c. R. Glou. 395.

136. But he that hadde taken oon, ghede ferth and *dalf* into the erthe and hidde the money of his lord, &c.—Wiclif, Matt. 25.

A more curious, and perhaps a more ancient letter-change permutes *th* to *d* in certain persons of the preterite, and in the participle. The following are Anglo-Saxon examples :—

			Pret.			Part.	
Sing.	cwæð	cwæde	cwæð,	*Plur.*	cwædon,		*say.*
	snað		snað,		snidon	gesnidden,	*cut.*
	seað	sude	seað,		sudon	gesoden,	*boil.*
	wearð	wurde	wearð,		wurdon	geworden,	*be.*

In the Old-English, the *d* seems to characterise the preterite throughout, and it is also used in the participle.

137. *Seethe* pottage for the sons of the prophets.—II. Kings, 4.

138. Jacob *sod* pottage.—Gen. 25.

139. The women have *sodden* their own children.—Lam. 2.

As the final *th* was changed to *d* in certain dialects, it is sometimes difficult to say whether the *d* has resulted from the dialect or from this letter-change. Chaucer (it would seem) uses *quod* both for the preterite and for the present tense, and other writers similarly used *quoth*. The North-Country verb *snathe* means to lop timber-trees (Ray), and *snod* means close-shaven, but the verb is more generally written with a *d* in all its tenses—to *sned*, to cut.

Another letter-change in the Anglo-Saxon converted *h* to *g*.

			Pret.			Part.	
Sing.	ah*	age	ah,	*Plur.*	agon,		*ought.*
	droh		droh,		drogon	dragen,	*draw.*
	sloh		sloh,		slogon	geslagen,	*slay.*

This letter-change occurs in the MSS. of the thirteenth century, but at a later period seems to have been neglected. We may indeed find the plurals *ogen, dragen, sagen,* &c. as late as the fourteenth century, but then we have also the singulars *og, drag, sag,* &c.; and

---

* This is one of the anomalous verbs, which use the forms of the preterite, but take a present signification (see No. 38. p. 157).

when the *g* was converted into *w* in the plural, *owen, drawen, sawen,* &c., we generally find it also in the singular, *ow, draw, saw,* &c.

The permutation of *s* to *r* has left more traces behind it. The four most prominent examples in the Anglo-Saxon are—

			Pret.			Part.	
Sing.	wæs	wære	wæs,	*Plur.*	wæron,		*be.*
	ceas	cure	ceas,		curon	gecoren,	*choose.*
	forleas	-lure	-leas,		-luron	forloren,	*lose.*
	hreas	hrure	hreas,		hruron	gehroren,	*fall.*

The Old-English conjugation of *was* has been already noticed*. A corresponding letter-change distinguishes the plural of the preterite and the participle of some other Old-English verbs; pret. sing. *les,* plur. *loren* or *lore,* part. *loren* or *lore.*

140. The lond *lese* (lost) the armes, changed is the scheld. R. Br. 8.

141. Here folc heo *loren* (lost) in þe se þorȝ tempest mony on.
R. Glou. 50.

142. Sibriht þat I of told, þat þe lond had *lorn*—
Had a cosyn, &c. R. Br. 14.

143. — after he had fair Una *lorn*
Through light misdeeming of her loyalty
And false Duessa in her stead had borne, &c. F. Q. 1. 4. 2.

144. Lauerde God we biddeth, &c.
That ure soule beo to the *i core* (chosen unto thee)
Noht for the flesce *for lore.*
Lambeth MS. q^d. Warton, Eng. Poet. sect. 1.

145. That weo beon swa his sunes iborene,
That he beo feder and we him *icorene.* Ibid.

146. Cornewayle hym lykede best, therfore he *ches* ther
To him and to his ospryng. R. Glou. 21.

147. My heart blood is well nigh *frorn* (frozen) I feel. Spens. Febr.

148. — the parching air
Burns *frore* and cold performs th' effect of fire. Par. Lost.

Icorene, ex. 145, is the plural of the participle *i-coren,* and *i-core,* ex. 144, merely another form of *i-coren. Lese,* ex. 140, is a clerical blunder for *les.*

The permutation of *th* to *d, h* to *g,* and *s* to *r,* occurs only in the past tense and participle; another permutation, that of *f* to *b,* is peculiar to the present tense. In Mæso-Gothic, a final *f* is often changed to *b,* when followed by an inflexion beginning with a vowel or consonant; *laubs,* a leaf (where *s* is the nominatival ending), is thus declined: N. *laubs,* G. *laubis,* D. *lauba,* A. *lauf*—the accusative yielding us the simple word stripped of all its appendages. In the Anglo-Saxon it seems necessary that the inflexion should open with a vowel. Thus *habban,* to have, has in its present tense—sing. *habbe, hæfst, hæfð*; plur. *habbað*; for its preterite *hæfde,* and for its participle *hæfd. Habban* is represented by the Old-English *habbe,* with which we must rank *libbe* to live, derived from *lif* life, and *hebbe* to heave, which has for its preterite *hef* or *hof.*

---

* No. 38. p. 152.

149. Þis is þe stat of Irlond, as *ich habbe* y tolde. R. Glou. 43.

150. So much *we habbeth* ever y be in franchise ȝet her to,
Þat, &c. R. Glou. 47.

151. The maistres and the messagers
Habbeth greithed the destrers. Sevyn Sages, 418.

152. Pycars fonden ese ynow and defaut none
To libbe in plente ynow, but of wymmen one. R. Glou. 42.

153. Fairer by a ribbe than ani man that *libbe*.
Child Horn. Cambr. MS.

154. — a stronge axe þat mony mon broȝte to deþe
So strong and so gret, þat an oþer hit sholde *hebbe* vnneþe.
R. Glou. 17.

155. With his lyft hand he *hef* (heaved) his gysarme
And thought to do Philotas harme. Alis. 2297.

Several verbs whose bases ended in *k*, as *make, take*, &c., appear generally to have dropped the *k*, at least as early as the fourteenth century.

156. Þe Romaynes laie sone a doun, he *made* emty place. R. Glou. 50.

157. Now duellis William eft fulle bare *mas* (makes) many wone
Of gode men er non left, but slayn er elkone. R. Br. 75.

158. — what devylle alys you two
Sick nose and cry thus to *may*? Townl. Myst. 264.

159. It is a tokyn that it *mase*
Of novelry
A mervelle it is, good tent who *tase*
Now here in hy. Townl. Myst. 124.

160. Wee'v meet neaw *tean* o horse-steyler whooa wur *meying* off with tit os hard os he cou'd.—Collier's Tim Bobbin.

161. The lordis bad that thai suld nocht him slay
To pyne him mar thai chargyt him to *ta*
Thus gud Wallace with Inglissmen was *tane*. Wallace, 2. 141.

162. There be four of us here have *taen* a thousand pounds this morning. —1 H. IV.

163. — the dule *tey* aw bad luck far me. Tim Bobbin, 1.

164. Wy *loo'* the (look thee) Meary, I thought so pleaguy hard ot I cou'd think o nothing at aw.—Collier's Tim Bobbin.

In modern English we use *made* for preterite and participle, and occasionally *taen* also as a participle.

In the northern dialects *have* apparently did not change its *v* to *b*, as in ex. 149, 150, 151; and as early as the fourteenth century *v* was very generally dropt: pres. sing. *ha'e* or *ha, hast, hath*; plur. *ha'e* or *ha*; pret. *hadde*; part. *had*; inf. *to ha'e* or *ha*. Vid. *hast*, ex. 83, 93; *hath*, ex. 84, 107; *han*, ex. 88; *hadde*, ex. 82, 97. The contraction *ha* is also common.

165. You *ha* done me a charitable office. Winter's Tale, 4. 1.

166. He shall *ha* the grograns at the rate I told him.
B. Jons. Every Man in his Humour.

Give also in certain forms dropt its *v*.

167. The cowrse Y wold that ye had sene
In the nownes ye had me the coppe *gene*.
Hunting of the Hare, 266.

See also ex. 39.

Kithe to show, and *graithe* to prepare, have for their preterites *kidde* and *graide*, and for their participles *kid*, *graid*. The conjugation of these verbs has nothing in common with that of *seethe*, *sod*, *sodden*; the *th* in these cases seems to be absorbed, or as it is sometimes called, assimilated, just as *hadde* is formed from *hafde*.

168. His craftes gan he *kithe*. Tristr. 1. 26.

169. Tristrem with gret honour
Kidde that he was hend, &c. Tristr. 3. 11.

170. But Florentyn *kydde* that he was slegh, &c. Oct, 1135.

171. I am ded if that this thing be *kid*. Ch. Squieres Tale, 252.

172. I shalle *grayth* thy gate,
And fulle welle ordeyn thy state. Townl. Myst. 47.

173. — now ar we ryght arayde—
Bot loke oure gere be redy *grayde*. Townl. Myst. 214.

The preterite *clad* seems to have been formed from *clothe* in like manner.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. FEBRUARY 13, 1846. No. 42.

H. A. WOODHAM, Esq. in the Chair.

The following work was laid on the table—

"Sophoclis Tragœdiæ Superstites. Recensuit et brevi annotatione instruxit Gulielmus Linwood, M.A. Ædis Christi apud Oxonienses Alumnus. Londini, MDCCCXLVI."

A paper was then read:—

"On the Derivation of Words from Pronominal and Prepositional Roots." By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

The languages commonly called synthetic agree uniformly in this leading feature of being resolvable into a comparatively small number of elements, usually denominated *roots*. In Hebrew there are few derivative words which are not capable of being referred to their parent stem; or when this cannot be done within the limits of the Hebrew itself, the root wanted may generally be supplied from the Arabic or some other cognate dialect. We here speak of the Semitic roots as they are usually given by grammarians, and do not now enter into the controverted question whether they are primary or in reality compounded. In Welsh also there are few derivatives which may not be satisfactorily accounted for either from the radicals of that language, or from the Armorican and Gaelic dialects. In like manner the Indian grammarians have reduced the whole of the Sanscrit language to a comparatively small number of *d'hatoos* or roots; and there is no reason for doubting that in a great majority of cases the secondary and composite forms are rightly referred by them to their originals. There may be room to question their conclusions in particular instances, especially with regard to pronouns and particles; and it may be also suspected that a number of ostensible roots are in reality mere varieties of form or collateral descendants from some unascertained primitive.

These roots are commonly regarded as mere abstractions, that is, not actual practical words, but words *in posse*; and they are generally explained, either by an abstract noun in the locative case, or a verb in the third person; indeed they are almost universally represented to be *roots* of *verbs*, and consequently more nearly related to the verb than to any other part of speech. Bopp and Pott, who frequently question the positions of the Indian grammarians, do not dissent from them in this general view of the subject; except that, instead of deriving pronouns and simple particles from verbal roots, they consider them, or the elements out of which they are formed, as a class apart, neither descended from verbs, nor in any way related to them. With respect to the non-derivation of those elements from verbs, they are probably in the right; but whether, on the other hand, verbs and other parts of speech may not occasionally be derived from them, is a different question, which a small amount of research will enable us to decide in the affirmative. Proofs might be multiplied from many languages; we shall at present content ourselves with a few examples from the Old High-German.

ABA. The Old-German preposition corresponding to the Sanscr. *apa*, Gr. ἀπὸ, is *aba*, only occurring in this form in the oldest monuments of the language. From this we have the adjective *ab-uh*, sinister, perverse, i. e. *deviating*, branching into several derivative nouns, along with the verb *abahon*, to abominate. A verb more directly formed from the root may be inferred from the participial form *aband*, evening, *i. e.* declining, which again is enlarged into the verb *abanden*, vesperascere.

ABAR, AFAR, AVAR. This word, evidently a comparative form of the preceding, is in Gothic a preposition, with the sense of Lat. *post*; but in Old-German it is an adverb, commonly denoting *again*. From it the verb *avaron*, to repeat, is directly formed, together with a number of nouns in all the dialects; among which may be specified Goth. *afar*, series, and Ang.-Sax. *afara*, *eafora*, a descendant.

OBAR, UBAR. This preposition, found in nearly all the Indo-European dialects, forms in O. H.-Germ. the verbs *obaron*, to put off, prolong, and *ga-obaron*, to surpass, overcome. Compare Lat. *superare*.

ANU, without. Mod.-Germ. *ohne*. *Indanon*, afterwards *entanen*, to deprive.

IN—forms the verb *innon*, bearing the various meanings of to annex, bring, receive, admit, &c. along with the nouns *innod*, viscera, *innote*, indigena, and several others. From the comparative form *innaro*, inner, is derived *innaron*, to insinuate; and with the prefix *er*, *erinnern*, to remember.

UZ, out. From this come the verbs *uzon*, to renounce; *ga-uzon*, to remove, exclude. From the comparative *uzaro* is derived the present Germ. *aüssern*, to express, enunciate. The Engl. *utter* is evidently of cognate origin.

NIDAR, below, beneath. *Nidarjan*, to humble, condemn; *ganidaron*, to cast down; with many nouns and adjectives.

NAH, near, after. *Nahen*, to approach; *zuonahen*, to hasten, come near.

SAMAN, with, together. *Samanon*, to gather, congregate; with a multitude of derivatives.

SUNTAR, apart. *Suntaron*, to separate.

The above list might be greatly enlarged; but enough has been given to show, not merely the abstract possibility, but the fact of the derivation of verbs and other parts of speech from simple particles: analogies will readily suggest themselves from the Greek and other languages, but they are too obvious to be here dilated upon. It may perhaps be objected that all the above instances are of comparatively recent date, and that no similar principle of formation can be traced in the earliest stages of language. It is apprehended that we know too little of language in its infancy, either to affirm or deny this proposition on direct and positive grounds: the utmost that we can expect to accomplish is to deduce probable conclusions from the data and the analogies within our reach. It is however conceived, that there is no inherent improbability in the supposition that verbs and other words might equally be formed from similar elements at a much earlier period.

Terms expressive of local relations must have existed in every regularly organized language at least as early as some other classes, and the powers of combination and symbolical application inherent in the human mind could be as easily exercised on words expressing separation and connexion in space, as upon any other attributes cognizable by the senses. That those terms are themselves of the highest antiquity is admitted by the best philologists; indeed Bopp does not scruple to characterize them as "antediluvian." The origin of the words themselves is a question which we do not undertake to discuss. It is not perhaps absolutely impossible that they were primarily *onomatopœiæ*, or imitations of natural sounds; but there are many difficulties in the way of such an hypothesis. Wüllner, and other writers who have laboured with great ingenuity to account for the formation of language by this process, have felt the difficulty of dealing with this branch of the subject; and while they allow that pronouns and particles are an original and very important part of language, they admit that it is not easy to establish a connexion between the enunciation of a sound and the idea of a place.

Waving therefore the discussion of this point as being beyond our means of information, we proceed to inquire whether there is any evidence of particles and pronouns having actually become roots of verbs and nouns at an early stage of the Indo-European languages. We shall begin with a class of languages which have hitherto been only partially employed for purposes of general philology, but which it is believed are calculated to throw considerable light on several obscure phænomena.

The Cymric and Armorican preposition denoting *over, upon*, is *gwar* or *gwor*, commonly abbreviated to *gor* in the former language, but subsisting in its original form in the latter. The corresponding Gaelic term is *for*, now obsolete except in composition. Now there is a large class of words—nouns, adjectives and verbs—which may be more naturally and obviously referred to this preposition as their root, than to any other in the compass of the Celtic languages. Thus we have W. *gwarad*, covering; *gwarchâu*, to enclose; *gwared*, to guard; *gwer*, a shade, and many similar words. These again have their counterparts in Germanic, Latin, and Slavonic words commencing with *w* or *v*, or in Greek words which formerly had the digamma. Many of these terms are referred by Pott, Benfey, and other German philologists to the Sanscrit *varāmi* or *varayāmi* (from the root *vṛi*), commonly denoting to cover or to choose. Admitting this, it follows that if the Celtic terms are related to the corresponding Teutonic, &c., they must be equally so to the Sanscrit; in other words, Sanscr. *varāmi*, Goth. *warjan*, Celt. *gwarad*, &c., all denoting covering, must be of common origin. The next step in the investigation is to see what probable grounds we have for referring these terms and their cognates to a local or prepositional relation as their original root.

Pictet, in his 'Affinité des Langues Celtiques avec le Sanscrit,' observes that the Irish *frith* and W. *gwrth*=against, are the counterparts of Sanscr. *prati*, Gr. προτὶ, and that Ir. *for*, W. *gwor* or *gor*, correspond to *pra, parā*, Gr. πρὸ and παρά. Among the Celtic prepositions which have no formal representatives in Sanscrit or Greek, he specifies Ir. *fa, fo*, sub, apud, &c., W. *gwa*, *go*=under. Against the etymology of *frith* and *gwrth* there is nothing to object: with respect to *for* and *gor**, it is to be observed that they, as well as the Lithuanian *per*, always signify *over*, *upon*, and therefore are potentially equivalent to Sanscr. *upari*, Gr. ὑπὲρ, Germ. *ubar*, &c. With respect to *fa, fo*, &c., it is strange that Pictet did not perceive that they bear precisely the same relation to Sanscr. *upa*, Gr. ὑπὸ, that *frith*, &c. do to *prati*, προτὶ, with their cognates; a relation further borne out by the analogy of the Slavonic and Lithuanian *po*, *pod*, under, after, &c., which are clearly cognate with the corresponding Sanscrit and Greek, and also it is believed with the Celtic. Thus we have a strict parallelism throughout: *gwa, fa* = *upa*; *gwar, for* = *upari*, and *gwrth, frith* = *prati*.

If therefore the preposition *gwar*, upon, is cognate with Sanscr. *upari*, and is at the same time the root of *gwarad*, covering, &c.—which come as naturally from it as *supero* does from *super*—it follows that *upari* and *varāmi* are related to each other, and that an element simply denoting *upon*, *over*, may be the primordial one in the latter word. If this point could be once well-established, it would lead to conclusions important in themselves, and calculated to simplify in no small degree the current ideas of the organization of language. We shall at present hypothetically assume this position, and proceed to inquire how far the actual phænomena of language are found to coincide with it.

As preliminary to the ensuing discussion we may observe, once for all, that the Cymric *gw* = Irish *f*, is convertible in Welsh to a simple guttural *g*, *c* (*ch*), or to a labial *b*, *p* (*m*): in Sanscrit it corresponds generally to *w*, occasionally to *sw*; to a labial, guttural, or palatal: in Slavonic to *v*, a labial or palatal: in German to *qu*, *w*, *g*, *b*, *p*. Correspondences with other dialects will occasionally be noticed in the sequel. *R* is also commutable with other liquids, generally with *l*, and is not unfrequently transposed; e. gr. *var*, *bar*, *par*, may become respectively *vra*, *bra*, *pra*, &c. We shall also consider the Sanscrit roots, *varn*, to colour; *vrit*, *hvri*, *dhvri*, generally denoting turning, deflection, v. t. q. *val*, to cover; *hval*, to move to and fro—the corresponding forms to which in other dialects frequently interchange significations—as etymologically related to each other and belonging to the class which we are proposing to examine. If we assume then that *gwar*, upon, over, may become the parent stem of verbs and nouns, as the Germ. *ubar* becomes

---

* The Welsh equivalent of παρὰ is *ger* = by, adjoining.

ubaron, the words most obviously connected with it are those simply denoting superposition, covering or elevation. Among these we may class *gwarad, gwarch, gwarth*, covering; *gwarchdu*, to enclose; *gwer*, a shade; *gweryd*, turf, sward. In the Teutonic languages we have Goth. *warjan*, to cover; O. H.-Germ. *wara*, a dwelling; *werjan*, to dress; A.-S. *wreon*, to cover. In Slavonic *vrieti*, to cover or shut up, whence *vrata*, a door or gate; *vr'ch*, a summit (comp. Armen. *i werah*, over, upon); and many similar words. The Sanscrit words derived from *var* (*vrĭ*), denoting clothing, equipment, armour, and other modes of covering, are pretty numerous; one of the most remarkable is *urnū*, wool, which it is curious and instructive to trace through the cognate dialects. The initial *v* or *w* vocalized in *urnū*, and dropt in *lana*, reappears in Slavon. *vl'na*, Lithuanian *wilna*, Goth. *wulla*, where *n* is assimilated to the preceding liquid. The Welsh *gwlan* presents the fullest form of the word, as Gael. *ollan*, and Gr. ἐρίον the weakest. The Latin *villus, vellus* (for *vilnus, velnus*?) are probably related. The antiquity of the term and the attribute meant to be denoted by it are sufficiently evident. The English *flannel*, from W. *gwlanen*, which might have been a Gaelic form, is a good example of the change often made in adopted words.

Passing over for the present the numerous formations in *gwal, val, bal* &c., believed to be connected with the above, we may next observe, that there is an easy and obvious transition from the idea of covering to that of defence or protection. Connected with this we have in Welsh *gwared*, to guard (whence Ital. *guardare*, Fr. *garder*); *gwarant*, security; *gwersyll*, a camp; *gwerthyr*, a fortification. In Teutonic, *warjan, werjan* (O. H.-G.), to defend; *gawer*, defensive armour; A.-S. *wer*, a wear or embankment; with a multitude of similar words in many languages. Allied with the idea of defence is that of prohibition, examples of which are W. *gwarddu*, to forbid; Germ. *wehren*, to keep off; *warnen*, to warn. From the notion of protecting, the transition is also easy to that of watching, observing, beholding, seeing; as may be seen in the Ital. *guardare*, to guard or watch, to observe, to look; Germ. *warten*, to beware, to perceive; analogous to which is Lat. *tueor*, to defend, to behold. A simpler form occurs in the A.-S. *wær*, wary; Germ. ge-*wahr*, observant; with which the Gr. ὄρω, to guard, ὁράω, to see, may possibly be connected. The Welsh *gwyliaw*, to watch; *gwyled, gweled*, to see; appear to be from the same root, substituting *l* for *r*; as may be inferred from Bret. *gwere*, Irish *faire*, watch, where *r* is preserved. Another modification of the same idea is that of endurance, continuance; as may be seen in the German *warten*, to watch, also to expect, wait; and in a more simple form in O.-Germ. *wēren*, to abide, endure; *wirig*, permanent; and in a metaphorical sense, A.-S. *weorig*, weary, tedious.

Pott and other German philologists also refer to the same root Germ. *war*, Lat. *verus*, true; *q. d.* covered, protected, secure. If we admit this, the W. *gwir*, Gael. *fior*, true; Slavon. *viera*, faith, belong of course to the same category. Again, what is covered may at the same time be concealed, whence A.-S. *wreon*, to hide;

Dan. *vraa*, O.-Eng. *wro*, a secret corner. Comp. Lat. *velare*, *revelare*.

The next class of words which we propose to consider as connected with the root in question, is that involving the idea of crossing, deviating, turning, &c., both literal and metaphorical. A relation between this and the former class is easily established if we keep in mind that what lies or passes over a surface may *cross* it, or deviate from what is assumed to be its proper direction, or go beyond its natural limits. Thus *transire flumen* may be indifferently rendered to go *over the* river, or *across* it, or beyond it; and he who thus crosses a river deviates at the same time from the natural direction of its current, and may also turn from it by passing further. The most original Celtic form appears to be the Breton *gwara*, to bend; whence *gwarek*, a bow (compare Lat. *arcus*); *gwarog*, a yoke. The Welsh *gwyr*, oblique, curved; *gwyraw*, to bend; Irish *fiar*, crooked, slightly deviate in form, while the Engl. *wry* transposes the liquid. The German furnishes the full form *quer*, across, athwart; and the weaker *werran*, to disturb, confuse; *ga-werran*, to overturn; *wir-t*, deflected, distorted. If we regard the Sanscrit *vrĭt* as connected with the simpler form *vrĭ*, we are enabled to connect with this class the Lat. *vertere*, to turn; Germ. *werden*, to become, *q. d.* to turn out; Slavon. *vratiti*, to turn; Lithuanian *wersti*, to turn, roll; A.-S. *wræthian*, to wreathe, entwine; and many other words. The list might be extended to some hundreds of terms, by including all the varieties of form caused by a substitution or modification of radicals, a few specimens of which will be given in the tables.

The secondary and metaphorical ideas connected with the relation of *turning*, are too numerous to be specified individually. A multitude of words bearing the literal significations of roll, twist, throw, variegate, corrupt, surround, shake, and the moral or metaphorical ones of err, deceive, pervert, transgress, &c., referable more or less directly to the class under consideration, will readily occur to the comparative philologist. To *choose*, Sanscr. *varayūmi*, O.-Germ. *weljon*, Lith. *weliti*, Gr. *αἰρέομαι*. may be explained as *to set aside*, out of a larger number = Lat. *seligere*. To *will*, Welsh *gwŷll*, *gwyllys* (voluntas), Germ. *wollen*, Lat. *volo*, Gr. *βούλομαι*, is evidently related, as may be seen at once from the Lat. *opto*, to wish and to choose.

The extent of the field of investigation ostensibly connected with the particular class of words under consideration, may be inferred from the circumstance that Benfey, in his 'Griechisches Wurzel-Lexicon,' traces to them nearly a thousand Greek vocables; and had he been fully aware of the resources derivable from the Cymric and Armorican dialects, he might easily have found many more. These dialects satisfactorily explain many phænomena otherwise not easily accounted for; as for instance *gwar*, *gwyr*, oblique, curved, show at once the possible connexion between Germ. *quer*, Lat. *varius*, *varus*, Engl. *wry*, Gr. *γυρὸς*; to say nothing of Lat. *curvus*, Gael. *cor*, *car*, turn, twist; Gr. *εὐρὰξ*, awry; with a multitude of words more or less deflecting from the original type, but easily reducible to it according to recognized analogies.

We have all along treated the word *gwar* in the light of a simple and independent radical; there is however every reason to believe that it is in reality a comparative form of *gwa* (*gwo, go*), as Sanscr. *upari* is of *upa*, and Goth. *ufar* of *uf*. To speak more strictly, *gwar* is a combination of two prepositional elements, *gwa* + *ar*, the latter having in itself the sense of *upon, over*, in all the Celtic dialects. Each of these elements is the parent of other words: thus *gwa* is enlarged into *gwadn*, base, foundation (comp. Germ. *boden*); *gwaddawd*, dregs; *gwael*, low, base (Lat. *vilis*); *gwas*, a servant, vassal: while *ar* becomes W. *aros*, abiding, dwelling; Gael. *ard*, lofty (Lat. *arduus*); *airde*, height; *ardaighim*, to elevate, &c. That the Sanscr. *upari*, Goth. *ufar*, should be compounds is easily conceivable, if we reflect that A.-S. *butan* (our *but*) is composed of three distinct elements, *bi-ut-an*, and *abutan* (about) of four. If therefore *gwar*, to cover, turn, &c., is connected with the preposition, it is not in the strict sense of the term a primary word; and if we are correct in the view which we have all along taken of the matter, the same will apply to the Sanscrit *vrĭ* and the other ostensible roots supposed to be connected with it. It is believed that they are all reducible to one leading notion, viz. that of *covering*, as included in the preposition or adverb *upon*, which again is itself probably of pronominal origin.

This view of the matter is further strengthened by the comparison of the collateral element *tar* in Gaelic, = over, upon, in conjunction with W. *tra, tros*, over, *trwy*, through, &c., with the Sanscrit root *trī*, to pass over, and its numerous cognates. Words apparently including this element abound in every branch of the Indo-European family; and they will be found on examination to run parallel throughout, or nearly so, with the class previously examined, in the senses of covering, preserving, watching, turning, throwing, transgressing, &c. This coincidence is easily accounted for if we suppose that both classes contain the same prepositional element *ar* = over, upon—giving pretty nearly the same force to each. It is believed that the same element, both in the simple form *ar* and the augmented *tar*, enters into the comparative forms of adjectives and particles, and various other formations in which the idea of *more, further*, v. t. q. is included.

It will perhaps be thought that it is a series of ungrounded assumptions to regard the words in question as connected with each other, whereas they may be independent roots. To this it may be replied, that it is equally an assumption to maintain that they are totally unconnected with each other; and if they *are* related, as the general analogy of their forms would rather lead us to believe, it is clear that they cannot be at the same time collateral and primary. The science of comparative etymology does not, like arithmetic or geometry, rest upon certain and demonstrable premises, but consists in a series of presumptive deductions from such analogies of form and meaning as can be traced in languages known or believed to be cognate. We have no direct evidence that *wary, warn, wear, weary, wry, wreathe, writhe*, are all from the same root; but it is conceived that no one who has traced them carefully through all the kindred dialects would venture to assert that they are radically and totally distinct. An attempt has been made to show that those, and multitudes of similar words may be referred to one simple local relation; and if this be really the case, it is obvious that the same principle may be applicable in many more cases. Such words as περάω, περαίνω in Greek, and *samanon*, *uzon*, &c. in German, show that particles may and actually do become the parent stems of verbs; and it is at least as intelligible and easy that *over* should become *cover*, or *cross*, as that *out* should come to denote *speak*, or *in*, remember. If it should be found, on further investigation, that this principle of derivation has prevailed to a great extent, it will follow that the doctrine of Bopp and Pott, viz. that the pronominal and prepositional roots constitute a class apart, wholly unconnected with the elements of verbs, cannot be supported. On the contrary it would seem more probable that those roots are in many cases the real primordia of the ostensible *d'hatoos* or verbal roots, and that they in fact constitute the basis of no inconsiderable portion of the Indo-European languages.

The following words, constituting a very small portion of the aggregate, seem directly referable to the Sanscrit roots *hvrĭ*, *vrĭ*, *vrĭt*, *hval*, *val*, already assumed to be related to each other. The Celtic words are Welsh when not otherwise specified.

gwal, enclosure.
gwalc, palisade (cf. Ital. palco).
gwalch, *adj.* towering, *sub.* falcon.
gwalen, Bret. a ring.
gwall, defect, error.
gwar, Bret. crooked, vaulted.
gwàr, neck (from *turning*; cf. Sl. vrat).
gwara, to fence.
gwarad, covering.
gwarant, security.
gwarch, covering.
gwarchâu, to enclose.
gwarddu, to prohibit.
gwared, to guard.
gwaremm, Bret. a warren.
gwarez, Bret. shelter, protection.
gwarog, a yoke.
gwarth, covering.
gweilging, a cross-beam.
gweili, a surplus.
gweled, to see.
gweli, an exposure.
gwell, better.
gwellt, grass, sward (cf. gwallt, hair of the head).
gwer, a shade.
gwere, Bret. a watch-tower.
gwerthyd, a spindle (Ir. fearsaid).
gweryd, sward.
gwil, turn off, start.
gwilc'hu, Bret. to squint.
gwill, apt to stray.
gwir, true.
gwladychu, to govern (cf. Germ. walten).
gwores, open, exposed.
gwrag, curved handle, *v. t. q.*
gwregys, girdle.
gwrīth, apparent.
gwrydd, a wreath.
gwylchu, to seem or appear.
gwylied, to watch.
gwyll, will.
gwyllt, wild.
gwyr, oblique.
gwyrain, to elevate.

Slavonic, Lithuanian, &c.

varati, Serv. to deceive.
variti, Sl. to proceed.
wahrpsta, Lettish, spindle.
wahrst, to bolt.
wahrstiht, to roll to and fro.
wahrti, a door.

wairitees, *verb. refl.* to beware.
wairoht, to augment.
waldiht, to govern.
walgs, cord, rope (from twisting).
warra, power.
warren, *adv.* exceedingly.
warreht, to be powerful.
wehrigs, observant.
weley, Lithuan. late.
wercziù, I turn over.
werpju, I spin.
weru, I close; at-w- = I open (cf. Welsh a-gori; Bret. di-gori, to open; Lat. a-perio, o-perio).
willoju, I seduce (Lett. wilt, to deceive).
wirrags, Lett. a whirlpool.
wirs, upon.
wirssus, Lith. a summit.
wirst, Lett. to rise upwards.
wirstu, Lith. I overturn, become (cf. Sanscr. vrĭt, to turn, to become; Germ. werden).
wirtis, a whirlpool.
wirwe, a cord.
woloju, I roll about.
z'welgiu, I see, look.
z'wairu, I squint.

The corresponding forms in the pure Slavonic dialects generally transpose the liquid, as will appear from the following examples:—

wlada, Bohem. power, government (cf. W. gwlad, country; Bret. glad, patrimony; Ir. flaith, sovereignty).
wladnauti, to move, stir.
wlati, Slav. to fluctuate.
wlna, Bohem. wool.
wrat, turn, return. Serv. vrat, neck.
wrata, a door.
wratiti, to turn.
wratky, giddy.
wreteno, a spindle.
vrieti. Slav. to shut.
vr'gu, I throw (cf. Lat. torqueo).
vr'zu, I open.
vr't, a garden.
vr'tieti, to turn round.
vr'ch, a summit.

Some of the principal Teutonic equivalents having been given in the course of the preceding paper, it will not be necessary to repeat them. The Greek forms are reserved for an inquiry which it is proposed to make into the powers and affinities of the digamma. The following Latin words may be referred with more or less probability to the same class of roots:—

valeo, to be powerful.
valgus, bandy-legged.
vallum, an entrenchment.
valvæ, folding-doors.
varioli, small-pox (cf. W. brech, variegated; also small-pox).
varius, changeable, &c.
varus, crooked (cf. præ-varico, &c.).
vellus, a fleece.
velum, a veil, covering.
vertere, to turn.
vertex, summit.
verus, true.
volvere, to roll.
vortex, a whirlpool.

The above words, to which a multitude of similar ones might easily be added, correspond pretty strictly with the forms assumed as their radicals. There are, moreover, an immense number of terms which are referable to the same origin, by taking into account the changes briefly indicated above by elision, transposition, and the substitution of elements etymologically cognate. A few examples will serve to illustrate this portion of the subject.

The following are cognate forms with the elision of the labial:—

gail, the eye-lid.
gallt, a steep or cliff.
gardd, an enclosure.
garth, a rampart.
geol, a prison.
gour, Bret. slowness, leisure.
gol, a covering.
golwg, sight.
gor, Bret. a tumour.
gorch, a fence.
gorddi, to impel forward.
gored, a wear.
gorel, opening.
gores, open, exposed.
goreu, superior, best.
gori, to brood.
gormant, exuberance.
gormu, to force in, intrude (cf. ὁρμάω).
Bret. gorre, top, surface.
— gorrea, to raise.
— gorrek, slow, idle (in some dialects *gwarek*).
— gorroen, cream.
— gourinn, lintel of a door.
— gourzizu, to delay, put off.

In Breton, words of this description are frequently still further abbreviated by the elision or transposition of the leading vowel.

glad, patrimony;	Welsh gwlad.
glao, rain;	— gwlaw.
gleb, moist;	— gwlyb, moisture.
gliz, dew;	— gwlith.
gloan, wool;	— gwlan.
grac'h, old woman;	— gwrach.
greg, woman;	— gwraig (cf. Germ. frau).
grisien, root;	— gwraidd.

These and similar forms show that words commencing with a guttural followed by a liquid, may correspond to a Sanscrit, German or Slavonic *w*: e. gr. *glad*, to Germ. *walten*; *gloan*, to Sanscr. *urnā*, Bohem. *wlna*, Germ. *wolle*. A little inquiry will enable us to discover a multitude of words commencing with a labial or guttural followed by *l* or *r*, under significations precisely analogous to the words already given, and in all probability of kindred origin. A few examples from the Lithuanian and Lettish will place this point in a clearer light.

Lith. breest, to increase.
Lett. brunnas, armour.
— glahbt, to guard, protect.
Lith. globoju, I embrace.
Lett. gredsens, a ring.
— greest, to turn.
— greests, a coverlet.
— greest-balki, cross-beam.
Lith. greju, I surround, enclose.
Lett. greiss, awry, crooked.
Lith. greziu, I turn, bore, encircle, wind (cf. Bohem. wrtiti, wrtati, to turn, shake, waver, move, churn, bore, &c.).
— gryśstu, I turn, return.
Lett. klaht, to cover.
Lett. klaidiht, to wander about.
Lith. klaupju, I kneel down.
— klesscziu, I tremble.
— kloju, I cover.
— klonoju, I bow down.
— klydeju, I wander.
Lett. krahpt, to deceive.
— krampis, a bolt.
Lith. krattau, I shake.
— krauju, I heap up.
— kreikiu, I strew.
— kreiwas, crooked; cf. W. crwm; Ger. krumm.
— kreipju, I turn, return.
— priess, prep. against = W. gwrth.

It is not meant to be asserted that all the above words are certainly connected with the Sanscrit and Celtic roots which we have been examining; but the connexion is theoretically possible, according to known analogies. The probability of its subsistence is greatly strengthened by the Persian, in which a Sanscrit or Teutonic *w* regularly becomes a guttural: e. gr. *gurāzah*, hog or boar = Sanscr. *varūha* (comp. Lat. *porcus*, Germ. *ferch*, Eng. *barrow-pig*, Gr. *χοῖρος*); *gardan-iden*, to turn = Sanscr. *vrĭt*, Lat. *verto*, &c.; *garm* = Germ. *warm*; *kirm* = Germ. *wurm*. The Slavonic and Lithuanian languages manifest a considerable resemblance to the Persian, both in words and characteristic elements.

It is scarcely necessary to say, that words commencing with *bal*, *bar*, *pal*, *par*, &c. are still more likely to be related to the family of words which we have been examining; indeed the affinity of many of them does not admit of a doubt. This will become obvious on comparing such words as *bal*, peak; *balch*, proud; *bar*, summit; *bern*, a heap; *parc*, enclosure; Fr. *parer*, to keep off; Span. *parar*, to stop, &c., with the preceding lists and with the Gaelic. *Gweilging*, W. a cross-beam (from *gwail*, superincumbent), becomes in Gaelic *baircin*. It is in all probability also the etymon of Engl. *balk* and Germ. *galge*, a gallows. Many similar instances might easily be collected.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. FEBRUARY 27, 1846. No. 43.

Professor GRAVES in the Chair.

"A MS. Vocabulary of Cornish Words" was laid on the table. Presented by Henry Batten, Esq., of Penzance.

Two papers were then read:—

1. "Remarks on certain Doubtful Constructions found in the Works of Attic Writers." Communicated by the Rev. G. C. Renouard.

A question was started by Professor Malden in his paper, "On Mistakes in the Use of Obsolete Greek Words by Attic Writers*," respecting the word *προθέλυμνος*, and he proved very satisfactorily that it means 'one upon another,' like *ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις*, as stated in the 'Etymol. Magn.' and by Suidas long ago. But as nothing is known of the origin of the word, we may throw out a hint, that *θέλυμνος* is the abbreviated form of a compound *θαλο-θάμιν-os*, 'many-shoot.' It seems probable too, that as we meet with *τετρα-θέλυμνος* in Homer, the correct word is *τρι-θέλυμνος*, especially as in Aristoph. Ἱππ. 538, where *προ-θέλυμνος* is found, three things are spoken of, *δρῦς*, *πλατάνους* and *ἐχθρούς*. The *προ* seems to have been introduced by the half-poets and half-grammarians of Alexandria, who explained *προθέλυμνος* by *πρό-ριζος*. In like manner *προ* has been substituted for *τρι* in the Scholia on Aristoph. Νεφ. 997, and Ὀρν. 282, transcribed by Suidas in Προκέφαλος.

With respect to the passage quoted by the Professor from Æschylus, Ἑπτ. Θηβ. 220, *Ἔκηλος ἴσθι, μήδ' ἄγαν ὑπερφοβοῦ*, he will no doubt be glad to know that the dramatist wrote *μηδ' ἄγαν, πτέρ' ὥς, φοβοῦ*. For though *ἄγαν* might follow *ὑπὲρ*, as shown by Eum. 804, *ὑπερθύμως ἄγαν*, it could not precede it. We meet indeed with *Ἄγαν ὑπερβριθὲς ἄχθος ἤνυσαν* in Soph. Aj. 951. But there the antithetic verse, *Τίνος ποτ' ἆρ' ἔπραξε χειρὶ δύσμορος*, points to some error which Hermann would correct by reading *ἔρξε*. He should have suggested rather *Ὑπερβεβριθὸς ἄχθος ὁ θεὸς ἤνυσεν*. For we thus not only recover the nominative, at present wanting for the verb, but can see that *ἄγαν* was introduced here from v. 982, *ὦ περισπερχὲς πάθος. Ἄγαν γε, Τεῦκρε.* Be this however as it may, it is evident that in Æschylus one can hardly dispense with the simile, *πτέρ' ὥς*, 'like birds,' an animal peculiarly subject to fear, as shown by Euripides in Hec. 177, *οἴκων μ', ὥστ' ὄρνιν, θάμβει τῷδ' ἐξέπτηξας*: where none have seen, what is plain enough, that the poet wrote *οἴκων μ', ὥστ' ὄρνιν θάμνων, τῶνδ' ἐξέπληξας*. For *πτήσσω* is a verb intransitive; besides, as Polyxena is compared to birds, so ought the house to be compared to a bush, as in Æsch. Agam. 1287, *θάμνον ὡς ὄρνις*: where Blomfield refers to *καταπτήξας ὑπὸ θάμνῳ* in Homer: while as regards *πτερὰ*, 'birds,' we may compare *διέπτατο*

---

* See No. 29. p. 57

Ὥσπερ πτερὸν πρὸς αἰθέρα in Eurip. Her. F. 509, and *ὡσεὶ πτερὸν ἠὲ νόημα* in Homer.

Lastly, with respect to *ἰότης*, Professor Malden explains it, as the old Greek Lexica do, by *βουλή*. For if it were connected with *ἰὸς*, 'an arrow,' and derived from *ἵω*, 'I send,' it would mean: 1. the act of sending; 2. the design, and be *ἰότης*. The chief difficulty however in this derivation is, that all nouns in *-ύτης* are formed from adjectives. Hence *ἰό-της* has been explained by an anonymous editor, whom Griffiths has silently followed, *one-ness*; as he probably derived it from the obsolete *ἰὸς*, *one* (whose feminine *ἰὰ* is found in Homer), and had perhaps a recollection of the expression in Holy Writ, 'and they two shall be one flesh;' and of that in Homer, where Venus says, *καὶ σφ' ἄκριτα νείκεα λύσω Εἰς εὐνὴν ἀνύσασα Ϝενωθῆναι φιλότητι*, —a passage that should have deterred Dindorf from rejecting the distich in Eurip. Tro. 674, *Καίτοι λέγουσιν, ὡς μι' εὐφρόνη χαλᾷ Τὸ δυσμενὲς γυναικὸς εἰς τἀνδρὸς λέχος*. It is however difficult to understand why the Professor should have translated *ἀμφὶ λουτρὰ καὶ λέχος σὸν ὑμεναίουν ἰότητι γάμων* in Prom. 571, 'I hymned at the ablutions and your bed on account of the marriage.' For as *ὑμεναιοῦν* is a verb transitive, it must have its object, and hence we must read with the anonymous editor, *ἰότητα*, 'At the ablutions and around your bed I hymned the oneness of marriage.'

2. "Contributions to the Study of the Languages of Africa."

By R. G. Latham, M.D.

The languages of Africa have drawn far less attention than their importance both in philology and ethnography demands. The Semitic tongues being generally dealt with as a separate class, and as Asiatic; the isolation of the Coptic, and its supposed points of difference with other languages having generally been insisted upon; and the Malagash of Madagascar being disconnected with the languages of continental Africa in order to be associated with those of Polynesia—a very trifling amount of investigation, if we except that of the Berber dialects (which have only lately begun to attract attention), represents our researches upon the number, structure, affinities, and classification of the numerous tongues of continental Africa.

The reason of this lies less in the deficiency of our *data*, than in the extent to which they are fragmentary and dispersed. With no collection of grammatical results analogous to those which we possess for the Indo-European class of languages; with no well-arranged list of comparative vocabularies, such as the 'Asia Polyglotta' furnishes for the more unknown tongues of Siberia and Mongolia; with not even the amount of speculation bestowed upon the structure of the languages in question, which those of America have found at the hands of Duponceau, Gallatin and others—the study of the numerous dialects requisite for a proper African ethnography has been more incomplete than it is for any other portion of the world of equal magnitude. This statement is verified by turning to the pages of either Adelung's 'Mithridates,' or of Dr. Prichard's 'Physical History of Mankind.' The details upon Africa are in both cases disproportionately small, and the classification is pre-eminently irregular in respect to the value of its divisions; and this naturally. The pioneers in this department of literature have been few.

The current doctrines concerning the affinities of the African languages are, perhaps, as follows:—

1. That the line of demarcation between the Semitic tongues and those of Northern Africa, such as the Coptic and Berber, is broad; but that it is not so broad as the limits between the Semitic and the true so-called Negro languages.

2. That the Coptic may have a few miscellaneous affinities with the Semitic tongues on the one side, and with some of the remaining North African ones on the other; but that it has at present no definite ethnographical position.

3. That grammatical affinities of the Berber dialects are to be sought for in the Semitic tongues; but that their glossarial relations are at present undetermined.

4. That, without determining precisely what modern Abyssinian tongues are or are not descended from the Semitic of Old Æthiopia, the isolation of such (whatever they may be) in respect to the true African—and especially the so-called Negro—languages is to be insisted on.

5. That a marked peculiarity of grammar separates the great group of languages allied to the Caffrarian from those of Africa in general, and also from the Semitic dialects.

6. That the remaining languages, spoken chiefly by the tribes to whom the term Negro is most particularly applied, may be in any degree whatever of relationship to one another: *i. e.* that isolation, like that of the Basque language in Europe, may be a common phænomenon, or that one large group may contain the majority of the languages of Africa.

Over and above these doctrines, we have a few good observations upon several special affinities; as a set-off to which we could also record more than one theory of the most egregious absurdity.

In respect to their classification, the principles of the two above-named works—Adelung's and Dr. Prichard's—coincide. It is the same as that adopted by Gallatin in his arrangement of the Aboriginal languages of the United States; by which only the smaller and the more definite groups are recognized, whilst speculations as to their value are wisely and conveniently abstained from. The advantage of this method is, that it leaves the after-labourer in the same field nothing to undo.

The question that most naturally presents itself is that of the amount of our materials. Although primary and important, this must be dealt with briefly and in a general way; the geographical arrangement being the most convenient.

1. The class of languages akin to the *non*-Arabic dialects of Algeria and Morocco have lately received a large share of illustration. Under the names of Berber, Kabyle, Amazirgh, &c. they have been studied by French, Swedish, English and American phi-

lologists. The conquest of Algeria accounts for this; whilst the labours of Venture, Delaporte, Newman and others give us hope that the true relations of the Berber will not much longer remain a mystery. We have both a grammatical and a glossarial knowledge of this group.

2. Nubia and Dongola.—For the banks of the Nile, between Ægypt and Æthiopia, our *data* are imperfect. In an ethnographical view, however, this *desideratum* is comparatively unimportant; since the affinities of the proper Nubian have been shown to be with the languages of Kordofan, and the parts farther south and west.

3. For Kordofan and Darfur our *data* consist in vocabularies. Of these the most important are the tabular ones of Rüppell. Isolated glossaries, such as the Shangalla of Salt, and the Qâmamyl of Caillaud, illustrate this group.

4. Numerous as are the languages of Abyssinia, we have reason, according to Dr. Beke, to believe that, in some degree or other, we possess specimens of them all. The Galla is known grammatically through the grammars of Krapf and Tutschek. Of the allied Danakil we have the vocabulary of Isenberg. The vocabularies of Beke take us as far southward as Yangaro or Gingiro.

5. South of Abyssinia, both on the sea-coast and inland, our knowledge is lamentably fragmentary. The Somauli dialects in the neighbourhood of Cape Gardafui are known to be Galla, but the southern limits of this group are undetermined. From these parts down to Delagoa Bay, we have, with the exception of two MS. vocabularies of the Sowaiel, and the Makooa languages, in the possession of Mr. Leigh and the Asiatic Society respectively, nothing but short glossaries; a probable exception being made for some inaccessible *data* in Portuguese, for the languages of Sofala and Mozambique. The reasons that have been given for believing that even up to the Galla boundary, the languages on this side of the continent are Caffre, being at present inconclusive, indicate the great value of any new lists that could be added to our vocabularies north and south of the Mozambique coast.

6. For both the Caffre and the Hottentot languages of the Cape our *data* are sufficient for ethnological purposes. Boyce's 'Kaffre,' and Archbell's 'Bichuana Grammar,' exhibit the characteristics of these languages and mutually illustrate each other.

7. From the Orange river to the Portuguese possessions of Benguela and Angola, &c., the dialects of the country are wholly unknown. The grammatical affinities however of the Congo and Angola languages with the Caffre—affinities which have long been recognized—make it probable that they belong to the same group.

8. To the Portuguese possessions on the western coast of Africa—Benguela, Angola, Loango, &c.—the same remark applies which was made in respect to the eastern settlements: viz. that although additions may have been made to our philological knowledge since the publication of the 'Mithridates,' few are accessible to the reader in England.

9. The equator is an important line of demarcation. South of

this, the more immediate affinities seem to be with the languages of the Cape; north of the equator, they are with those of the coast of Guinea. This is the current doctrine; and that some such line of demarcation really exists is very probable. It is the opinion however of the present writer that its breadth is exaggerated.

10. From the Gaboon to the Bight of Benin.—For this tract our *data* are more fragmentary than they ought to be, considering our relations to the countries in question. We have no grammar for any of the languages on the Cameroons, the Calabar, the mouths of the Niger, or the kingdom of Benin; whilst the vocabularies are few, fragmentary, and frequently to be found only as MS.

11. For the country between Benin and Dahomey, both on the coast and inland, we have, besides vocabularies, the Yebou Grammar of D'Avezac, and the Yorriba Grammar of Crowther.

12. For Dahomey we have but fragmentary vocabularies.

13. For the kingdom of Ashantee we have full vocabularies, but no grammars beyond those enumerated in the 'Mithridates.'

14. For the coast between Ashantee and Sierra Leone, we have vocabularies sufficient to serve as samples of the languages. For the Bullom we have the Grammar of Nylander.

15. The Mandingo and Woloff languages bring us to the limits of the Great Desert, where we meet the Berber and Arab tongues. For the Mandingo we have the Grammar of M'Briar; for the Woloff, that of Dard. Besides these, the last volume of the 'Mémoires de la Société Ethnologique' furnishes us with copious vocabularies of the Seracolet, Sereres, Bagnon, and Feloop—languages which it has hitherto been convenient to consider isolate and unconnected. Nevertheless there are several tongues in this neighbourhood, of which we have, as yet, no specimens. The Susu, of which we have a grammar, is allied to the Mandingo.

16. The interior of Africa is less of blank than is generally imagined. For the central parts south of the Mountains of the Moon, it is true that we have absolutely nothing. On the other hand, however, unless we suppose that, like the Basque of the Pyrenees, some wholly isolated language may be spoken on the north side of the Jebel Kumri—an assumption which though probable must not be made gratuitously—the whole belt of country between the Great Desert and the Mountains of the Moon, north and south, and between the Upper Nile and the Atlantic, east and west, is more or less philologically known to us. Thus, beginning with Kordofan and Darfur, we have for those countries the vocabularies of Rüppell and others. These go as far south as Fertit; whilst there is no doubt that the group of languages which they represent is conterminous with the groups represented by the vocabularies of Dr. Beke.

Further eastward we have the Borgho of Burckhardt, the Begharmeh of Denham, the Bornou of Denham and others, the Mandara of Denham—our southern limit in these quarters—and the Haussa Grammar of Schön. The Haussa language is conterminous with the Yoruba, the Mandingo, and the languages of the Ibo and Ashantee groups. These bring us to the Atlantic.

17. For the important dialects of the Foulah language our *data* are scanty and insufficient.

It is considered that the details of the material, of which the above-given sketch, supplementary to the 'Mithridates,' is a mere general outline, are sufficient, if cautiously and carefully used, to justify, even in the present state of our knowledge, views more general than those which are currently afloat concerning the ethnography of Africa, as determined philologically; a subject to which, it is hoped, a future paper may be devoted.

[To be continued.]

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Vol. II. MARCH 13, 1846. No. 44.

Professor Wilson, V. P., in the Chair.

A paper was read—

"On English Verbs, substantive and auxiliary." By Edwin Guest, Esq.

The singular of the verb substantive was essentially the same in the Anglo-Saxon as in our modern English *am*, *art*, *is*; but in the south of England the plural form was *synd* or *syndon*, and in the north of England *earon*. The southern plural disappeared from our dialects in the course of the twelfth century; and the plural of *be*, which in the Anglo-Saxon was used almost exclusively with a future signification, became its substitute, till superseded in later times by the northern plural *are*:—

1. And his Sarsyns "as ermes" cryde
"We *beth* betraid." Octov. 1630.

2. Alle heo *beoth* forsworene. and alle heo *beoth* forlorene.
They are all forsworn and they are all lost men.
Laȝamon, Battle of Bath.

3. Þe kyngus knygtes þerto
Þat robbars *beþ* and men quellares & versuore also. R. Glou. 455.

4 — thou savourest not the things that *be* of God but those that *be* of men.—Mark 8.

The plural verb seems to have gradually introduced the singular forms *be*, *best*, *beth*, which are still used in the west of England, though they have never been adopted by our literature.

The verb *be* however was long retained for the expression of future time, and more particularly in the north of England. In three of the following examples it takes the northern inflexion *s*.

5. Ne see ȝe þat her hors beþ suyftore þan ȝoure be
Þat ȝe *beþ* (ye will be) dede anon, ȝyf ȝe wolleþ fle. R. Glou. 397.

6. — if thou may that fulfille
Alle *bees* done (will be done) right at thi wille. T. Myst. 324.

7. Bot luke welle Eve my wife
That thou negh not the tree of life,
For if thou do he *bees* ill paide. T. Myst. 7.

8. Quhair Christ is king quhais time interminabill,
And hich triumphand gloir *bees* never gane.
Lynds. Complaint of the Papingo.

In ex. 5, *beth* is used to express both present and future time. This confusion of meanings was in some measure rendered unnecessary in our southern dialects by the very general use of *worth* with a future signification; sing. *worthe*, *worst*, *worth*, plur. *worþeþ*.

9. Help þi kynde eritage, & þou *worst* (shalt be) þer kyng anon.
R. Glou. 101.

10. For Souþhamtone he ys y cleped, & *worþ* euer mo. R. Glou. 69.

11. Shal no lewednesse lette. þe clerk þat ich lovye
That he ne *worþ* ferst avanced. Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 1.

12. Grote watres *worþeþ* ȝet rede of monnes blode,
Cristendom *worþ* y cast adoun. R. Glou. 132.

This verb is very rarely found with a present signification in the Old-English. Its preterite however is not uncommon—*worþ*, or as it is sometimes more accurately written, *warþ*. The infinitive is *worþe*.

13. And so it fell upon a dai
Forsoth as I you tellen mai
Sire Thopas wold out ride,
He *worth* (was) upon his stede gay, &c. Ch. Sire Thopas.

14. — in a wynkynge I *worth*. and wonderliche ich mette.
Vis. de Dowel, pass. 2.

15. He boughte such a bargayn. he was the bet evere, &c.
Such a wynning hym *warþ*. Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 6.

16. He let þe kyng al *y worthe* & to Rome drowȝ. R. Glou. 87.

17. Backe hem noȝt, but let hem *worþe*. Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 3.

18. My ioie is tourned into strife
That sober shall I never *worthe*. Gower, Conf. Am. 5.

When an infinitive preceded by *to* follows the verb substantive, it generally indicates some necessity or obligation.

19. The Germans in Greek
Are sadly *to seek*. Porson.

20. — a sight, that *was to be seen*
Cannot be spoken of. Winter's Tale, 5. 2.

but sometimes duty, or intention arising from a sense of duty.

21. I have seen two such sights by sea and land—but *I am not to say* it is a sea, for it is now the sky; betwixt the firmament and it, you cannot thrust a bodkin's point.—Winter's Tale, 3. 3.

22. *I am* not like other men *to envy or undervalue* the talents I cannot reach, for which reason I must needs bear a true honor to this large eminent sect of our British writers.—Swift, Tale of a Tub, Preface.

I am not to say may be considered as equivalent to "I ought not to say," or "I will not say."

These idioms in our earlier dialect would have been rendered by the gerund. This latter form occasionally conveyed a passive signification, "he is *to lufigenne*," he is to be loved. The infinitive gradually superseded the gerund, and when so used sometimes indicated obligation, sometimes a possibility or mere future contingency.

23. This vision *is ȝet to drede* (ought to be dreaded) think and gif God
kepe. R. Br. 66.

24. And bidde of me wat þou wolt and ich wol þe grante ywis,
For elles ich were vnkynde, gif it *to grante ys*. R. Glou. 115.

25. *Its not to tell* heaw camm'd things con happ'n!—Coll. Tim Bobbin, 6.

26. *'Tis yet to know*
(Which when I know that boasting is an honour
I shall promulgate) I fetch my life and being
From men of royal siege. Othello, 1. 1.

Johnson thought that in the phrase "he is to blame," *blame* was a noun; and in this mistake he would no doubt have been confirmed had he remembered the line—

27. In faith, my lord, you are *too wilful blame.* 1 H. IV. 3. 1.

But though Shakespeare's contemporaries appear to have considered *blame* as an adjective, yet the phrase "he is to blame" must be ranked with the idioms we are now discussing; the analogies of our language point too clearly to its origin to leave us in any doubt about its character.

If the following sentence be correctly printed, the infinitive was sometimes used without the *to.*

28. *Its not tell,* but Ist marvel strangely an yo leet on a wur kneave in this.—Tim Bobbin, 2.

It was shown in a former paper*, that the verb *is* entered into construction with all the personal pronouns, *I is, thou is, we is,* &c. These phrases followed by the infinitive were used to denote future time.

29. — come not near the old man—keep out che vor ye, or *I'se try*† whether your costard or my bat be the harder.—Lear, 4. 6.

30. — hing the pan ore th' fire ith reken creauk
And *Ise wesh* sile and dishes up ith neauke.
Yorkshire Dial. (A.D. 1697.)

31. *I's think* on (I shall think) ot teaw looks o bit whisky, &c.
Collier's Tim Bobbin.

32. *Ise plainly tell* ye, ye are breeding up your family to gang an ill gate, &c.—W. Scott, Rob Roy.

33. Eigh forseure it war long o him, bud *thoux hear,* &c.—Cars. Craven Dial. 1.

34. I'll nifle em fray him, &c. *he's* never *trail* his awn gallows at his back as long as I can help it.—Cars. Craven Dial. 1.

35. — Ise vara weay, for that's ill warke
Ise flaid *weese net get* there before 't be merke.
Yorksh. Dial. (A.D. 1697.)

---

* No. 38. p. 151.

† Shakespeare puts this phrase into the mouth of a Kentish peasant, but there is reason to doubt if it were ever used south of the Thames. In the north of Essex it was certainly known as late as the sixteenth century.

It seems probable that some of the broken phrases which Shakespeare assigns to his two foreigners Parson Hugh and Dr. Caius, may have been borrowed from the popular idiom we are now considering:—CAIUS. By gar he is de coward Jack Priest, *he is not shew* his face, &c. P. EVANS.—Ay, and her father *is make* her a pretty penny, &c. In other cases there seems to be confusion between their *is* and the verb *has.*

36. Quoth I with a' my heart I'll do't,
I'll get my Sunday's sark on,
An meet you on the holy place,
Faith *we'se hae* fine remarkin. Burns, Holy-fair.

37. Aweel, aweel, said the Baillie, somewhat disconcerted, *we'se let* that be a pass-over, &c.—W. Scott, Rob Roy.

38. By the masse and she burne all *you'sh bear* the blame for me.
G. Gurton's Needle, 1. 2.

From the root *is* was formed in the second person singular *ist**; and it would appear that *thou'st* as well as *thou's* was used to denote future time.

39. If *thoust be* silent, I'se be glad,
Thy maining maks my heart full sad.
Lady Ann Bothwell's Lament (Mrs. Grant?).

40. Alack o dey, theaw knows boh little oth matter, boh *theawst hear*, &c. —Collier's Tim Bobbin, 2.

41. Come Tum, sed he, egad iftle geaw with us *theawst see* sitch gam os tha newer saigh eh thi live; beside *theawst howd* the riddle, &c.—Collier's Tim Bobbin, 2.

But this verbal form will admit of more than one explanation, and the difficulties connected with it require a rather careful examination.

We learn from Gill's 'Logonomia Anglica' that in his time the Lincolnshire men used *I'st* and *thou'st* for *I will* and *thou wilt*, and from Collier's little work that the same forms were prevalent in Lancashire during the last century.

42. Whau! sed I, *Ist go* see (I'll go see).—Collier's Tim Bobbin, 5.

43. I'll oather have a ginny for hur or *hoost newer gooa* (she'll never go) while meh heeod stons o meh shilders.—Tim Bobbin, 5.

44. Yoan stown that tit sed he, on *yoast gooa* back wimmy before o justice.—Tim Bobbin, 6.

45. *Ist naw have* one boodle t'spere o my ohyde sylver.—Tim Bobbin, 5.

46. I think eh meh guts *Ist stink* like a foomart while meh neme's Tum. —Tim Bobbin, 2.

47. Sed hoo, whot dunneh meeon mon? *yoast naw put* (you wo'nt put) Yorkshar o me, &c.—Tim Bobbin, 5.

Were these the only examples we had to deal with, a ready mode of explanation would present itself. In our northern dialects, *to* before an infinitive very commonly elided its vowel, as in ex. 45 we have *t'spere* for *to spare*. Hence we might infer that *Ist go, thoust go*, &c. were merely different modes of writing the phrases *I's t'go, thou's t'go*, &c. But in the following examples *st* answers to *should*, or as it was usually written in our northern MSS. *sud*, and the foregoing explanation is no longer applicable.

48. Hoo towd me—an if I went whom agen *I'st be* (I should be) e dawnger o being breant.—Tim Bobbin, 7.

49. Odd! boh yoarn bowd, *Ist o bin* (I should have been) timmersome, &c.—Tim Bobbin, 3.

---

* No. 38. p. 151.

50. It wur weel for yo ot e coud'n sleep at aw, for *Ist neer ha lede* (I should never have laid) meh een together I'm shure.—Tim Bobbin, 7.

51. What coud onny mon do?—doo, *Ist o gon* (I should have gone) starke woode.—Tim Bobbin, 1.

Now in certain cases *should* is equivalent to *shall*, and in ex. 28, *Ist marvel* might be rendered either "I should marvel," or "I shall marvel." In the second person singular also *st* indicates future time (*vide* ex. 39, 40, &c.). Hence we might conjecture that the northern auxiliary *sud* was contracted into *st*, and then, by virtue of the false analogy afforded by the inflexion of the second person singular, was gradually employed to indicate future time in all the persons. Perhaps however it would be safer to conclude that we have here, as in so many other cases, a confusion of forms, and that *st* represents both constructions, so that *Ist* might answer either to *I sud* or to *I's t'*. On this hypothesis *thou'st* might be considered as the representative either of *thou sud*, of *thou 's t'*, or of *thou ist*, according to the circumstances under which it occurs.

In the preceding examples we have found the infinitive sometimes preceded by *to* and sometimes not. Originally the *to* was prefixed to the gerund but never to the present infinitive; as however the custom gradually prevailed of using the latter in place of the former, the *to* was more and more frequently prefixed to the infinitive, till it came to be considered as an almost necessary appendage of it. Many idioms however had sunk too deeply into the language to admit of alteration, and other phrases to which the popular ear had been familiarized, long resisted the intrusive particle. The *to* is still generally omitted after the auxiliaries and also after certain other verbs, as *bid, dare, see, hear, make*, &c. But even in these cases there has been great diversity of usage.

52. Eilred *myght nought to stand* þam ageyn. R. Br. 39.

53. — whether feith schall *mowe to save* him? Wiclif, James 2.

54. My woful child what flight *maist thou to take*.
Higgins, Lady Sabrine, 4.

55. — never to retourne no more,
Except he *would* his life *to loose* therfore.
Higgins, King Albanact, 6.

56. He said he *could not to forsake* my love.
Higgins, Queen Elstride, 20.

57. The mayster *lette* X men and mo
To wende. Octovian, 381.

58. And though we owe the fall of Troy requite,
Yet *let* revenge thereof from gods *to lighte*.
Higgins, King Albanact, 16.

59. I *durst* my lord *to wager* she is honest. Othello, 4. 2.

60. Whom, when on ground she grovelling *saw to roll*,
She ran in haste, &c. F. Q. 4. 7. 32.

On the other hand we have the phrase "we owe requite" in ex. 58, and Shakespeare wrote "you ought not walk." Indeed, even at the present day, the custom of our language can hardly be considered as fully settled in some of these cases, and therefore we need be the less surprised to find conflicting usages in other constructions at an earlier period.

Shall primarily signified *to owe*, and like its synonym, it signified secondarily that which ought or is fitting, or is settled to be.

61. For by the faithe I *shall* (owe) to God I wene,
Was never straunger, &c. Ch. The Court of Love.

62. Ne shulde take upon him no maistrie—
But hire obey and folwe hire wel in al
As any lover to his lady *shal* (ought). Ch. Frank. Tale, 22.

63. — he seide, han ye here ony thing that *schal* (is proper to) be etun? —Wicl. Luk 24.

64. The conquerour is laid at Kame dede in graue,
The Courthose befor said Normandie *salle* (is to) have. R. Br. 85.

65. Bot Henry David sone þat his heyr *suld* (was to) be
Contek for to schonne to Steuen mad feaute. R. Br. 111.

In the last two examples we may consider *shall* as expressing future time. This sense it formerly took in many cases in which the modern usage of our language would not tolerate it.

66. — the sande is now cum to within a 4 or 5 fote of the very hedde of them. The sande that cummith from Tinne workes is a great cause of this, and in tyme to come *shaul* (will) be a sore decay to the hole haven of Fowey. —Lel. Itin. 3. 19.

67. Whan he cam to Marseille & ouer þe se *suld* (would) wend,
Philip sauh his wille and after him gan send. R. Br. 87.

68. — but whanne eroude *schulde* (would) bringe hym forth, in that night petir was slepynge betwixe twei knightis, &c.—Wiclif, Deedis, 12.

69. — lever he hadde wende
And bidde ys mete, gef he *shulde* (might) in a strange lande.
R. Glou. 34.

Shulde in ex. 69 is the past tense subjunctive.

The use of *shall* to denote future time may be traced to a remote antiquity in our language; that of *will* is of much later origin, and prevailed chiefly in our northern dialects.

70. But be I ken'd heir walloway!
I will be slane. Lynd. Parl. of Corr. 3. 1.

71. I will win for him if I can, if not *I will* gain nothing but my shame and the odd hits.—Hamlet, 5. 2.

72. Rome—I will returne againe to thee
When lecher jester ingle bawd *I'll* be.
Fynes Morrison's Itinerary, p. 3.

Writers however who paid much attention to their style generally used these terms with greater precision. The assertion of will or of duty seems to have been considered by them as implying to a certain extent the power to will or to impose a duty. As a man has power to will for himself only, it was only in the first person that the verb *will* could be used with this signification; and in the other persons it was left free to take that latitude of meaning which popular usage had given to it. Again, the power which overrides the will to impose a duty, must proceed from some external agency; and consequently *shall* could not be employed to denote such power in the first person. In the first person therefore it was left free to follow the popular meaning, but in the other two was tied to its original and more precise signification. These distinctions still continue a shibboleth for the natives of the two sister kingdoms. Walter Scott, as is well-known to his readers, could never thoroughly master the difficulty.

As the auxiliaries *let* and *do* resemble each other in several peculiaries of their syntax, it may be convenient to range them together.

The construction of *let* with a noun as object, followed by an infinitive,—

73. He tok his suerd in hand, *þe croyce lette he falle.* R. Br. 18.

has been common in our language at every period of its history. But in the Old-English, when *let* governed a pronoun which was used in a general and indefinite sense, the pronoun was often omitted, as it was also after other verbs, such as *bid, make**, &c.

74. And Cordeille þe kyndom feng as þe ryght eyr,
And *lette* hire fadur *burie* (let them bury her father). R. Glou. 37.

75. And *lette* a fair tabernacle in honour of hym *rere.* R. Glou. 20.

76. Þo þis child was y bore me *lette* hym *clepe* Bruyt
(they let them call him Bruyt). R. Glou. 11.

77. — Lord it me forbede
Bote ich be holiche at þyn heste. *let honge* me ellis.
Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 4. Whit. ed.

78. *Let brynge* a man in a bote. in middes a brode water
The wynde and þe water. and waggynge of þe bote
Makeþ þe man many tyme. to stomble yf he stande.
Vis de Dowel, pass. 1.

79. — this cursed irous wretche
This knightes sone *let* before him *fetche.*
Ch. The Sompnoures Tale, 356.

80. — yn his baner a reed dragoun
He *lette arere.* Oct. 1695.

Do, to make, to cause, like the last verb, often took after it an accusative followed by an infinitive, which latter was sometimes preceded by *to.*

81. Þou couþest me wisse (show)
Were that Dowel dwelleþ. and *do me to knowe.*
Vis. de Dowel, pass. 1. Whit. ed.

82. Is this Jhesus the jouster quaþ ich. þat Jewes *diden to deye.*
Vis. de Dobest, pass. 1. Whit. ed.

83. — he spek mid hey men here of þis lond
And bi het hem faire y now & *dude hem to understonde*
Þat, &c. R. Glou. 78.

84. — a wicked maladie
Reigned among men, that many *did to die.*
Spens. Mother Hubbard's Tale.

---

* Vol. i. p. 220.

85. — when I die shul envy die with me—
Which while I live cannot be *done to die*.
Hall's Charge to his Biting Satires.

86. — the lot that *did me to advance*
Him to a king, that sought to cast me downe.
Sackville, Buckingham, 55.

but more frequently the *to* was omitted.

87. Ich wolde be wreke on þo wreiches. and on here werkus alle
An *do hem hongy* by þe hals. Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 3. Whit. ed.

88. God himself wercheþ
And send forþ seint esprit. to *don love sprynge*.
Vis. de Dowel, pass. 5. Whit. ed.

89. — Þat Conscience comaunde sholde. to *don come Scripture*.
Vis. de Dowel, pass. 6. Whit. ed.

90. *Wrightes he did make* haules and chambres riche. R. Br. 64.

91. Maccum kyng of þe iles, Dufnald fitz Omere—
He *did þam mak* feaute. R. Br. 35.

92. Right at Wynchester agayn þam gan he stand
Þe kyng þam bataille, and *did þam fle* þe land. R. Br. 21.

93. He mot not venge Herman—
He *did his ost turne again*, and had sorow inouh. R. Br. 10.

94. Þe maistrie of him þei wan, thei *did his folk* alle *die*. R. Br. 38.

95. Bot Hakon Hernebald sonne, of best he bare þe voice,
In stead of kynges banere he *did him bere* the croice. R. Br. 17.

96. — schapeth remedie
To sauen me of your benigne grace
Or *do me steruen* (cause me to die) furthwith in this place.
King James, King's Quhair, 3. 29.

Jamieson quotes the last example to prove that *sterve* meant to kill, "or do me kill"! In ex. 95 the pronoun seems to be reflective, "he caused himself to bear the cross."

The pronoun, governed by *do*, when used in a general and indefinite sense was very often dropt, just as we have seen it omitted after the verb *let*.

97. After Edbalde com Ethelbert his eam,
Athelwolfes broþer, of Egbrihtes team
He *did* him *coroune* kyng (he made them crown him, &c.)
R. Br. 20.

98. Þe abbot wex alle bind, þat *did* his bones *breke*
(that caused them to break, &c.). R. Br. 36.

99. Athelstan *did* him *bind*, both fote and hond. R. Br. 28.

100. Boþe wyndowes and wowes. ich wolle amenden and glase
And *do peynten & portreyn*. Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 4.

101. And so ich by lyve leelly. lordes forbode ellis
Þat pardon and penaunce. and preieres *don save*.
Vis de P. Plouh. pass. 4.

102. — good is that we also
In our time amonge us here
Do write of newe some matere. Gower, 1.

103. Let sche saide, swiche wordes ben
Other *I schal do bete* the so (I shall cause them to beat thee so)
That tho schalt neuere ride ne go. Sev. Sages, 1062.

104. He estward *hath* upon the gate above
In worship of Venus goddesse of love
Don make an auter. Ch. Knightes Tale, 1057.

105. This constable *doth* forth *come* a messager.
Ch. M. of Lawes Tale, 715.

106. Let *don him calle* (let them cause them to call, &c.).
Ch. Doctoures Tale, 173.

107. He lette the feste of his nativitee
Don crien throughout Sarra his citee. Ch. Squieres Tale, 38.

Notwithstanding the resemblance to our modern idiom, it may perhaps be doubted whether in any of these examples *do* is used as a mere auxiliary. The phrase "preieres don save" appears to mean, "prayers cause the powers above, the saints, &c. to save;" and even the phrase "do write," ex. 102, may possibly mean, "cause men to write;" or supposing the dropt pronoun to be reflective, as in ex. 95, "cause ourselves to write, &c." It is this omission of the reflective pronoun which seems chiefly to have given rise to our modern forms *I do love, thou dost love,* &c., which in their origin must have been equivalent to "I make me to love, thou makest thee to love," &c.

The use however of *do*, as a mere auxiliary, was well-established in our written language at the beginning of the fifteenth century; and clear traces of it may be found in the fourteenth, for instance in Chaucer.

108. And thus he *did* do slen (did cause them to slay) hem alle thre.
Ch. The Sompnoures Tale, 334.

109. — Fader, why *do* ye wepe?
When will the gailer bringen our pottage?
Is there no morsel bred, that ye *do* kepe?
I am so hungry, that I may not slepe. Ch. The Monkes Tale, 745.

The auxiliary *do* generally denotes emphasis: "I *do* say it, and it is true;" but in some parts of the west of England it seems to be used merely as affording a substitute for the ordinary conjugation. In Dorsetshire *do* indicates a continuing action, "they did die by scores," and the ordinary conjugation a single action, "he died yesterday." (Barnes, Diss. p. 28.)

The preterite of the verb *gin*, to begin, appears to have been treated in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as a mere auxiliary.

110. Al to soþe yt ys ycome þat Seynt Dunston *gan telle* (told).
R. Glou. 329.

111. He com his eam to socour fro fer þer he *gan wonne* (wonned).
R. Br. 17.

112. After Adelwolf his sonne hight Edbalde
To yere & a half þe regne *gan he halde* (held). R. Br. 20.

113. Edmunde þat in his tende yere at Peterburgh *gan deie* (died).
R. Br. 35.

114. Be the hawe-tre he *gan come* (came)
And thoughte to have therof some. The Seuyn Sages, 897.

115. And otheris eik the huge pillaris grete
Out of the querellis *gan do* hewe and bete (caused them to hew, &c.).
G. Doug. En. 1. c. vii.

This verb was sometimes written *can* by our northern writers.

116. For gret defens thai garnist thaim within
A felloun salt with out thai *can begyn* (begun). Barbour, 8. 744.

117. Euyn atte the mydday this ferly *con falle* (befell).
Anturs of Arthur at the T. W. St. 6.

118. The gled, the grip up at that bar *couth stand* (stood)
As advocatis, &c. Henrysone, The Dog, Wolf and Sheep.

119. The curate Kittie *could confess* (confessed)
And she told on, &c. Lyndsay, The Confession.

As to the form of the preterite *couth*, and the orthography of *could*, see No. 38. p. 154.

Become sometimes meant to hap, to be in a situation to, &c.

120. The felle bor *bicam to come*
The herde him seghth, and was of drad. Seuyn Sages, 904.

121. You shall have sometimes fair houses so full of glass that we cannot tell where to *become to be* out of the sun.—Bacon.

and *come* occasionally had a very similar meaning given to it.

122. A serpent ere he *comes to be* a dragon
Must eat a bat, &c. B. Jonson, Cataline.

At an earlier period the infinitive often followed *come* without the interposition of the *to*, in which case it may fairly rank as one of the auxiliary verbs.

123. Sone was filt paleys and tour
In *com gon* (went) the emperour. Seuyn Sages, 958.

124. — amideward the pres
Come ride maister Ancilles. Seuyn Sages, 958.

125. Sir Jon Giffard *com* aday, & Sir Jon de Balun there
Ride vpe tueȝe wolpakces, chapmen as hii were
To the west zate, &c. Rob. Glou. 539.

126. A grygp *cam fle* to take her prey
In that forest. Octov. 448.

127. The kyng of Jerusalem *cam dryve*
Ham to awreke. Octov. 1619.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. MARCH 27, 1846. No. 45.

JAMES YATES, Esq., in the Chair.

The following work was laid on the table:—

"Four Chapters of the Gospel of St. Matthew, translated into the language of Fernando Po." Presented by the Rev. Dr. Davies.

A paper was then read:—

"On certain Initial Letter-changes in the Indo-European Languages." By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

In the various branches of the great Indo-European family of languages, we find that multitudes of words differ from their cognates in form; and, to a certain extent, according to definite laws of permutation. This is more particularly the case with respect to their initial elements. If we take Sanscrit, Latin, Slavonic, or any other considerable member of the group as a standard, numerous instances occur in which a collateral language replaces an initial conjunct consonant by a simple one, or *vice versâ*, and substitutes a guttural for a labial, a palatal for a guttural, an aspirate for a sibilant, or one liquid semivowel for another. In many cases those permutations are well-understood and easily accounted for, but with regard to some of them there appears to be a little misapprehension.

It is usual to account for the substitution of a guttural for a labial, and similar phænomena, by the assumption that one is changed into the other. This appears actually to take place in a number of instances; as for example in the Neapolitan *cchiù* from *più*, Lat. *plus*: Gaelic *caisg* from *pascha*, and many others. But there are cases in which there is reason to believe that both the labial and guttural are in reality derivative sounds, collaterally descended from a more complex element, capable of producing both. The practicability of the process may be manifested by an obvious instance. If we could only compare Gr. δὶς and Lat. *bis* with each other, we should be compelled to affirm either that the labial was the representative of a dental, or that the words had no etymological connexion. But a reference to the Sanscrit *dwis*, at once shows that each has taken a portion of a more complex sound; the Greek having elided the labial, and the Latin dropped the dental. *Bellum* from *duellum* is a parallel instance. The grammarians inform us that *bonus* was originally *duonus*; and if so, it is very possible that the Welsh *dain*, beautiful, *daionus*, good, may be representatives of the ancient form, minus *u*, which in all probability emanated from a *v* or *w*.

The same observation may perhaps serve to explain certain phænomena connected with the Greek digamma. This element is supposed by some to have been a mere aspirate, and by others to have corresponded precisely with the Latin *v* or German *w*. The former supposition appears to be contradicted by the prosody of the Homeric poems: and though the latter agrees better with the collateral forms in other languages, it is not without its difficulties.

Priscian, after observing that it had commonly the force of a consonant in prosody, adds, "The Æolians are also found sometimes to have employed the digamma as a *double consonant*, as Νέστορα δὲ Fοῦ παῖδος." This view might be confirmed by numerous examples from Homer, in which an initial digamma frequently lengthens a preceding short vowel. As this never takes place with a Latin *v*, it is reasonable to presume that there was some difference in their respective powers; and this presumption appears to be strengthened by various phænomena presented by the Grecian dialects and the languages to which they are etymologically related. Words known to have had the digamma in the time of Homer, in other branches of the Greek language replace this element by a simple guttural or labial; and occasionally it appears to be represented by a sibilant, alone, or in connexion with a labial. On this and other grounds, Mr. Donaldson (New Cratylus, p. 119 *et seq.*) argues that the original digamma must have had a complex sound, consisting of a guttural combined with a labial, the former element being also convertible into a sibilant*. It is the object of the present paper to bring further evidence in favour of the general correctness of the above theory, from some collateral sources of illustration which it did not enter into Mr. Donaldson's plan to notice.

The illustration most in point is furnished by the Welsh. In this language the digamma, with its equivalents in other tongues, is usually represented by *gw*; *w* being nearly unknown in Cymric as a primary initial consonant. It was shown on a former occasion that the labial element may either be elided, as in W. *gwlan*, wool; Bret. *gloan*; or that the conjunct consonant may become a simple labial, as *balch* from *gwalch*. Precisely the same phænomenon is presented by the various dialects of the Greek. The grammarians and lexicographers have preserved a number of words in which γ or β appears as a prefix to the vowel initial of the ordinary dialect; and in almost every instance the words thus augmented are known, or may be strongly suspected anciently to have had the digamma.

The correctness of the forms commencing with *gamma* is admitted by Buttmann and Giesius, who agree in regarding the phænomenon as a dialectical peculiarity. On the other hand, Ahrens, in his elaborate work on the Doric dialect, is inclined to consider them as corruptions, or errors of Hesychius or his transcribers, who, not understanding the real nature of the digamma, substituted for it the character most similar in form. This summary method of deciding the point seems rather to cut the knot than to untie it; at all events

---

* Hoefer, in his 'Beiträge zur Etymologik,' has taken pretty nearly the same view of the subject.

it is an unsafe species of criticism to condemn everything as corrupt which we do not perfectly understand. We know that in Persian and other languages a guttural was the regular substitute for a Greek digamma*, and it is obvious that a change which took place in a cognate language might be equally admissible in a sister dialect.

As points of this kind are better illustrated by evidence than by abstract reasoning, an attempt will be made to support the genuineness of these and other apparently anomalous forms by instances from collateral languages.

Among the Hesychian glosses we find *γοῖνος*, *οἶνος*, with several derivatives, for which the critics without the smallest hesitation bid us substitute *Ϝοῖνος*. Undoubtedly this was a genuine form; but if we suppose, which is very possible, that the digamma was a double consonant, comprising a guttural and a labial, like the Welsh *gwyn*, or the Georgian *ghwini*, it is obvious that the former element might prevail in particular localities as the labial did in others. This view appears to be confirmed not only by the Welsh and Breton forms, but by the Armenian *gini*.

Another remarkable gloss in Hesychius is *γίαρες* = *ἔαρ*, which appears from the analogy of other words to have been a Bœotian form. Ἔαρ is well known to have had the digamma (comp. Lat. *ver*, Icelandic *vér*): but there is also the evidence of the Armenian *garoun*, in favour of the guttural. The Persian *bahar* presents another form of the labial; the Gaelic *earrach* is exactly parallel with the ordinary Greek. Benfey and other German philologists suppose a connexion with Sanscr. *vasanta*; *s*, as is frequently the case, being softened to *r*. This idea appears to be confirmed by the Slavonic *vesna*, and perhaps by the Cornish *guantoin*, W. *gwanwyn*, where *s* or *r* may have been elided. The Lithuanian *wasara*, summer, appears to be from the same root.

Ahrens, who is unwilling to admit that the simple guttural could become a representative of the digamma, allows that there is competent authority for it in the word *γρῖνος*, a hide or shield; which is also known to have had the digamma. Its genuineness is further attested by the Welsh *croen*, skin or hide. The Bohemian *blana* may possibly be related, *l* being frequently substituted for *r* in the Slavonic dialects. The direct affinity of the Norse *brynja*, a coat of mail, is doubtful; it being apparently from the Slavonic *brona*, which is referable to a root implying defence or protection, analogous to Germ. *wehren*.

Many other examples might be given wherein a guttural initial in other languages, or in the dialects of Greece itself, corresponds

---

* Mr. Donaldson observes, after Burnouf, that Neriosengh, who translated into Sanscrit the Pehlvi version of the Yaçna, represents the Zend *v* by the Sanscrit *ghv* or *gv*; thus for *vôhumanô*, *hâvam*, *çavangh*, he writes *ghvahmana*, *hâguana*, *çaguamgha*. (New Cratylus, p. 120.) It may be further observed that the modern Persian occasionally substitutes a labial, e. gr. *bad*, wind; *bist*, 20; Sanscr. *vinsati*. It may therefore be reasonably inferred that the ancient Persian archetype of those various articulations must have had a power bearing some analogy to that which we attribute to the digamma.

with the digamma. Some of these have been noticed in former communications, and a few others will be pointed out in the sequel. We proceed to adduce evidence in favour of other words where inscriptions or glosses appear to prefix a labial.

In the Tables of Heraclea, published by Mazochi, the digamma is regularly prefixed to the numeral *six* and its derivatives: **Ϝέξ, Ϝεξήκοντα, Ϝέκτος**, &c. This is pronounced by Ahrens to be a recent corruption, since neither the Sanscrit *shash*, Lat. *sex*, nor Gothic *saihs*, show any traces of a digamma. This is true; there is however no lack of evidence for it from other quarters. The fullest form extant is the Zend *ksvas*; and it is curious to observe how the component elements of the word appear and disappear in the cognate dialects. The Welsh *chweck* has preserved the guttural and labial; the Affghan *shpaj*, or *spash*, the sibilant and labial; the Albanian *giast*, the mere guttural; while the Armenian *wetz* corresponds pretty closely with the digamma-form of the tables. The Lithuanian *szessi* agrees closely with the Sanscrit: the ordinary Greek ἕξ substitutes an aspirate initial, and the Gaelic *sè* drops the final. The Heraclean forms, which doubtless agreed with the current language of the locality, are therefore not entirely unsupported by analogy; and this example may serve, among many others, to show how unsafe it is to decide points of this kind upon a narrow induction.

It is a well-ascertained peculiarity of the Æolic dialect that *β* was apparently prefixed to words beginning with *ῥ* in the ordinary language, as *βρόδον* for *ῥόδον*. Some grammarians regard this as a merely arbitrary process; but Priscian more correctly observes that it was a mutation of the digamma; and this view is fully confirmed by the analogy of the cognate languages. An excellent example is furnished by *βρίζα* or *βρίσδα*, the Æolic form of *ῥίζα*, which closely agrees on one side with the Gothic *vaurt-s*, and on the other with Welsh *gwraidd*, Bret. *grisien*. The Sanscrit *bradhna* may also be of the same family. Another Sanscrit term for *root*, *budhna*, has a remarkable resemblance to the Welsh *bun*, also found in Persian and in some Slavonic and Finnish dialects. If *budhna* be a mutation of *bradhna*, as it possibly may, all the above forms are reducible to a common origin. Βρόδον may be compared with the Armenian *ward*; *βρά*, *βραΐδιος* = *ῥέα*, *ῥᾳδιως*, with the Anglo-Saxon *hræd*, ready, where *h* represents a more ancient guttural; *βράκος*, a rag, with A.-S. *hracod*, ragged, and perhaps with Welsh *brat*, rag, *bratiawg*, ragged. **Ϝρῆξις**, quoted by Trypho from Alcæus, shows that *ῥήσσω* had the digamma; and this at once connects the verb with Germ. *brechen*, Lat. *frango*, and possibly with W. *brau*, brittle, *breuddilaw*, to comminute, and Slavon. *br'chu*, to grind.

It appears from Herodian and Hesychius that the Bœotian form of *γυνὴ* was *βανὰ*, *gen.* *βανῆκος*; respecting which Ahrens observes, after Grimm, that a comparison of the Gothic *quinō* shows that both *γυνὴ* and *βανὰ* have sprung from a more ancient *γ*Ϝ*ανὰ*, which also illustrates the mutations of the vowel. This is so obvious and satisfactory a solution, that it is strange that Ahrens did not think of applying it in those cases where he questions the genuineness of the simple guttural. He might also have found an admirable confirmation of it in the Welsh *gwen*, in conjunction with its synonym *benyw*, which are doubtless according to the same analogy. The Irish has also the duplicate forms *coinne* and *bean*. The Armenian *kin* closely agrees with *γυνή*. The Slavonic *zhena* (pron. *jena*, more Gallico) turns the guttural to a palatal. The Scandinavian *kone* vocalizes the labial: the North-Yorkshire *whean* is a softening of the Anglo-Saxon *cwen*.

In like manner the Elean Ϝράτρα for *ῥήτρα*, along with its primitive Ϝρέω and several cognate terms, may be referred to the Irish *briathar*, a word; Goth. *vaurd*; Lithuanian *wardas*, a name; Russ. *govoriti*, to speak; to say nothing of Lat. *verbum*. Γηρὺs, speech; the Welsh *gair*, a word, and Lat. *garrio*, are reducible to the same origin, if we suppose an elision of the labial. From a comparison of *βρόγχος*, frog, a word preserved by Hesychius, Benfey infers that *rana* was originally *vrahna*: the Cornish *kranag*, Fr. *grenouille*, and Armen. *gort*, equally speak for a guttural. The Yorkshire *frosk*, Germ. *frosch*, insert a sibilant; the Danish *fro* drops the final; the Lettish *warde* agrees pretty nearly with the Armenian.

An instance of the compound initial *gw* being represented by the hard labial *p*, occurs in W. *parc*, an inclosure, Eng. *park*; which we need not hesitate to connect with *gwarchâu*, to inclose; and perhaps with Ϝέργω, to restrain, Ϝέρκος; inclosure. Another, not commonly known, is furnished by Germ. *pfennig*, Eng. *penny*. Though this is found in most of the Teutonic and Slavonic dialects, it is confessedly not vernacular in any of them; and many unsuccessful attempts have been made to account for it. It is believed that the true etymon is the Breton *gwennek*, a diminutive of *gwen*, white; the coin being, as is well known, originally of silver. The Spanish *blanquillo*, and the Slovak *belizh*, from *bel*, white, are of exactly parallel import. The Welsh *ceiniawg*, together with its root *càn*, white, show an elision of the labial. Another instance would appear to be presented by *Πάξος*, given by Scylax as a name of the Cretan city called by Herodotus *Ὄαξος*, and on coins Ϝάξος. The genuineness of the reading in Scylax has been doubted, but the above examples show that such a form would not be absolutely impossible.

A few miscellaneous words, chiefly from inscriptions and ancient grammarians, are annexed, with illustrative forms from corresponding dialects. They are principally words known or presumed to have had the digamma.

βαδὺ = ἡδὺ	W. *chweg*, sweet. [cf. A.-S. *svæc*, odor, sapor.]
βάρνες, lambs	Russ. *baran*; Pers. *barah*; Armen. *garr*.
βιύζω = ἰύζω	W. *gwaeddi*, to shout.
δάβω = δαίω	W. *daiv*; Gael. *daigh*; Sanscr. *dah*; to burn.
ὤβεα = ὦα	Gael. *ubh*; A.-S. *æg*; Lat. *ovum*.
Ϝέσπερος	Bret. *gwesker*; W. *gosper*; Gael. *feascor*; Manks. *feastor* [cf. west, western]; Lith. *wakaras*.

Ϝέρδω, Ϝέργον	Germ. *werken*; W. *gorug*, made, did; Bret. *gra*, do [comp. Gr. *πράσσω*].
Ϝικατι, 20	Ir. *fiche, fichit*; W. *ugaint*; Pers. *bist.*
Ϝοίκος	Lat. *vicus*; W. *gwig*, town, hamlet.
Ϝρὶς (as inferred from the Homeric prosody.)	Bret. *fri*; W. *ffroen*, the nostrils [comp. Sanscr. *ghrāna*; Ital. *grugno*; N.-Yorksh. *groon*].
γάλι = *ἅλις*	W. *gwala*, enough.
γέλλαι (*u.v.* to pluck)	Lat. *vello*; A.-S. *pullian*?
γελλίξαι = *συνειλήσαι*;	W. *chwylaw*, to turn, revolve; Slav. *valiti*, to roll.
γεστία = *ἵματια*	W. *gwisg*, apparel; Lat. *vestis.*
γιτέα, osier	W. *gwden*; Eng. *withy.*
γοῖδα = *οἶδα*	W. *gwydd*, knowledge; A.-S. *witan*, to know.

The application of this analogy enables us not unfrequently to recover, at least conjecturally, a form that had been lost. From a comparison of *galleria*, ambulatorium, Ihre ingeniously infers that the French *aller* was originally *galler*. This conjecture derives a collateral support from the Breton *baléa*, to walk; *bali*, avenue; in conjunction with Germ. *wallen*; and all the forms taken in conjunction lead to the conclusion that the primary Celtic verb was *gwalla*.

Most of the permutations which we have been considering may be summed up in the counterparts for *wind*, in the different branches of the Indo-European family:—Welsh *gwynt*, Sanscr. *vahanta*, Lat. *ventus*, Slavon. *vietr*, Lithuanian *wejis*, Beluchī *gwath*, Irish *gaoth*, Persian *bad*. These forms not only illustrate the changes of the initial, but the appearance and disappearance of the nasal. The Greek *ἄνεμος* is probably from the same root, but with a different suffix. In its present form it bears an external resemblance to the Gaelic *anail*, W. *anadl*, breath.

The above examples, to which many others might be added, lead to the belief that the commonly received theory of labials and gutturals being commutable with each other is not in all cases strictly correct; but that each has frequently had an independent origin in a more ancient complex sound. The general progress of language is towards euphony and attenuation of articulations; it is therefore much more likely *à priori* that *w* or *v* should be modifications of *gw*, or some similar combination, than that the process should have been reversed. Words commencing with *qv* in Gothic, or *cw* in Anglo-Saxon, appear in other dialects with the simple labial, *e.gr.* A.-S. *cwanian*, Germ. *weinen*; and in this and similar cases there can be little doubt which form is the more ancient.

The establishment of this theory of an original complex sound, divisible in the way we have been supposing, would enable us to bring many apparently unconnected words together, and to diminish the number of ostensible roots. If we assume a primitive *gwal*, *qwal*, v. t. q. signifying to turn, roll, &c., it is easy to conceive how it might on one side become the parent of the Welsh *chwylaw*, to revolve; Sanscr. *hval*, to turn; A.-S. *hweol*, wheel; O.-Germ. *hwel*, crooked; Slavon. *kolo**, a wheel, *kolievati*, to agitate; and on the other, of Slavon. *valiti*, Germ. *wälzen*, Lat. *volvere*, to roll; with many similar words in most European languages. Formerly the only method of connecting *ἀλινδέω* and *καλινδέω* together, was by supposing that a guttural had been dropped or assumed. But the knowledge that the former anciently had the digamma places the matter in a different light, and makes it at all events probable that they are in reality collateral formations, and that they, together with their cognate *κυλίω*, *ἄλεω*, to wander about; *εἰλύω*, to, involve, &c., have a common origin with the Latin *volvo*, and the Welsh *chwylaw*, i. e. a root *gwal* or *qwal*, or something similar.

There is another remarkable mutation of the initial *w*, which though of partial occurrence, appears to be well-established. Graff observes that this element occasionally resolves itself into *ub*, e. gr. *ubisandus*, a low Latin word for *wisant*, a bison. Other examples are—*ubandus* for *wantus*, a glove (Ital. *guanto*); *ubartellus* for *quartellus*, a quarter measure. It would be worth inquiring whether a similar principle of formation may not have operated at a more ancient period; whether, for instance, the Latin *uvidus* may not be etymologically connected with our *wet*, and the Slavonic *voda*, water. The Celtic, Slavonic and Lithuanian words corresponding with Sanscr. *upa*, *upari*; Goth. *uf*, under; Germ. *ubar*, over; show no traces of a prepositive vowel: the initial *u* of the latter class of words may therefore have been evolved from a consonant according to the same analogy. It will not be denied that it was just as possible in the nature of things for *gwar* or *war* to become *ubar*, as for *wantus* to become *ubandus*. The prepositive vowel in *ὄβελος*, a spit, compared with Lat. *veru*, W. *ber*, may possibly be an analogous formation. Compare also *ὄβριμος*, *ὀφρὺς*, with their cognates in other languages. According to the same principle, the Goth. *ubils* may be related to W. *gwall*, or Lat. *vilis*; while the Norse *ill-r* may have lost its initial. Further examples of a similar process will be given in treating of the liquids.

---

* This word, with its derivative *kolasa* (Polish), a wheel-carriage, may perhaps throw some light on a disputed point of ethnology (Ovid, Trist.):—

> "Gens inculta nimis vehitur crepitante *colossa*;
> Hoc verbo currum, Scytha, vocare soles."

This remarkable word is perfectly Slavonic, both as to its root and termination. The few words of ancient Scythian that have reached us generally correspond with Slavonic, Teutonic, Medo-Persian, or some other Indo-European dialect. We may hence plausibly infer that the Scythians were not, as Rask supposes, Tschudes or Finns, but more nearly allied to the Slaves, if not their direct ancestors.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. APRIL 24, 1846. No. 46.

H. H. WILSON, Esq., V.P., in the Chair.

The following paper was read:—

"On the Ordinary Inflexions of the English Verb." By Edwin Guest, Esq.

Our ordinary verbs may be divided into two classes, those which form the past participle in *n*, and those which form it in *d*. We are told by grammarians that the former of these two classes is the more ancient, but the notion appears to be chiefly founded on the fact, that verbs of late formation or of late introduction into our language generally* made their participle end in *d*. The assertion sometimes ventured upon, that all the verbs which can be connected with the earlier development of our language belong to the first of these two classes, will hardly bear the test of examination. Many Anglo-Saxon verbs which must have originated in the first necessities of language form their past participle in *d*; and on the whole it may be safer to infer that both constructions took their rise in the infancy of our language, and at a period too remote to allow of our arriving at any satisfactory conclusion as to their relative antiquity.

In Latin grammar we find many verbs which in their present and past tenses follow different conjugations. This kind of grammatical inconsistency is still more prevalent in the Anglo-Saxon and the Old-English than in the Latin, indeed so much so, that in arranging our Old-English verbs it may be advisable to consider the inflexions of the present and past tenses independently.

In the Old-English dialect, the forms expressing the relations of present time are fashioned, for the most part, on one of three principles; the verbal endings are added either immediately to the base, or by means of an element which generally takes the form of *i*, or of an element which generally appears as *e*.

Ind.	*Sing.*	lovie	take	come.
		lovest	takest	comst.
		loveþ	takeþ	comþ.
	Plur.	lovieþ *or* lovie	takeþ *or* take	comeþ *or* come.
Subj.	*Sing.*	lovie	take	come.
	Plur.	lovien *or* lovie	taken *or* take	comen *or* come.
Imp.	*Sing.*	lovie	take	com.
	Plur.	lovieþ	takeþ	comeþ.
Infin.		lovien *or* lovie	taken *or* take	comen *or* come.
Gerund.		to loviene	to takene	to comene.
Part.		loviende	takende	comende.

---

* Generally but not invariably; the Northern participle *proven* is a well-known exception; and Bellenden and his contemporaries use *rang* as the preterite and the past participle of *reign*.

We will first give instances illustrative of the indicative mood of the *i* conjugation, confining our attention chiefly to those forms which have not been retained in our later dialect.

1. Doþ now al ȝoure wyt þerto. me wel to consayle
And *ich hopye* we sholle þe lasse recche of þe Romeyns tayle.
R. Glou. 195.

2. Thus by lawe quaþ oure lord. lede ich wol from hennes
Alle þat *ich lovye*. Vis. de Dobet, pass. 4.

3. He wente and *woneþ* (dwelleth) þere. up in to hevene.
Vis. de Dobet, pass. 1.

4. Thine cause quath Pandolf in rizte and nouȝt in wou
We *auancieth* as in God & *louieth* the inou. R. Glou. 503.

5. Ich ise wel, quath the king, þat ze ne *louieth* me nouzt.
R. Glou. 503.

6. Ich shal be ȝoure frende frere. and faile zow nevere
The wile *ȝe lovieþ* þure lordes. þat lecherie haunten
And *lackieþ* noȝt thure ladies. þat *lovyeth* þe same.
Vis. de P. Ploub. pass. 4.

The second conjugation was rarely used in Anglo-Saxon; but it gradually gained upon the other two, till in the fifteenth century it was generally recognised in our literature as the ordinary conjugation of the English verb. The plural inflexion *eth* was commonly used by the writers of that age, and may be occasionally met with as late as the sixteenth or even the seventeenth century.

7. — we Minorites most *sheweth*
The pure Apposteles lif. P. Ploughman's Crede.

8. Thei (the Carmelites) *maketh* them Maries men and so thei men tellen
And *leieth* on our Lady many a long tale. P. Ploughman's Crede.

9. If ploughman get hatchet or whip to the skrene
Maids *loseth* their cocke* if no water be seen. Tusser.

10. Grefe islet lyith scant half a mile est of Penare wherein *bredeth* gulles and other se foulles.—Lel. Itin. 3. 15.

11. Wevers *hath* now lomes in this litle chirch. Lel. Itin. 2. 22.

12. — mark the plage of thoes which *sucketh* blood.
Church. Siege of Edenbrough, 94.

13. Strong apprehensions of her beauty *hath*
Made her believe that she is more than woman.
B. and Fl., Laws of Candy.

In the last example Weber retains the *hath* as "a slight inaccuracy," and Giffard passes it over in silence.

The singular inflexion *th* has only recently disappeared from our western dialects; and indeed the use of it still lingers in the district beyond the Parret (Jenning's West Dial. p. 1). It seems long to have kept its hold upon the verb *have*; Fielding sometimes puts *hath* into the mouth even of his court ladies and gentlemen.

The forms which resulted from joining the verbal endings imme-

---

* The Shrovetide cock was won by the ploughman, if he made his appearance in the kitchen before the maids were up, and the kettle filled.

diately to the base are exceedingly common in our earlier literature; and notwithstanding the care with which our editors have "corrected" these archaisms, they are readily found as late as the sixteenth century.

14. — "we segeth the," Pandulf sede tho,
"That thou ne *berst* neuer eft croune," &c. R. Glou. 502.

15. "Water" he seyde what *þencst* ou? ich rede ne com no ver.
R. Glou. 321.

16. — what *thinkst*
That the bleak air, thy boisterous chamberlain
Will put thy shirt on warm? T. of Athens, 4. 1.

17. I ne wende noȝt that eny man my dunte ssolde atstonde
Ac þou ne *stonst* yt noȝt one, ac art al clene aboue. R. Glou. 309.

18. Why *standst* there (quoth he) thou brutish block. Spens. Feb.

19. Syre byssop wy ne *gyfst* us of þyne wyte brede. R. Glou. 238.

20. Þe erl Hue *comþ* ek aȝen ȝou, þat fals ys & versuore. R. Glou. 455.

21. Wery and wet as bestes in the rain
Cometh sely John and with him *cometh* Aleyn.
Ch. Reves Tale, 188.

22. Bountee *cometh* al of God, not of the stren
Of which they ben engendred. Ch. Clerkes Tale, 224.

23. And heareth him (the lion) come rushing, &c.
And *thinketh* (thincþ, A.-S.) here *cometh* my mortal enemy.
Ch. Knightes Tale.

24. And *byggynþ* to blowe & suþþe to bere frut. R. Glou. 352.

25. — the pope send his sonde
To erche bissops & bissops & *zifth* ech poer
In his bissopriche the & thine to amansi, &c. R. Glou. 502.

26. — the wo that prison may me yeve,
And eke the peine that love me *yeveth* also. Ch. Knightes Tale.

27. — y bured a Seyn Phylyppes day
And Seyn Jacob, as yt *valþ*, þe vorst day of May. R. Glou. 436.

28. Up starth a knave, and down there *falth* a knight.
Sir T. More, Boke of Fortune.

29. — on broþer
As ye seþ in nede *helpþ* there þat oþer. R. Glou. 341.

30. — drowned in the depth
Of depe desire to drinke the guiltlesse bloud
Like to the wolf with greedy lookes that *lepth*
Into the snare. Sackville, Buckingham, 5.

In the examples taken from Chaucer we have followed Tyrwhitt's orthography; but there can be little doubt that Chaucer wrote *thinkþ*, *comþ*, *yevþ*, &c.

Of the three subjunctive forms, the first is the only one which will require illustration.

31. — we esseth and na more
That thou *suerie* vpe the bok clanliche to restore
Holi churche that thou hast him binome, &c. R. Glou. 500.

32. — ich for bede vpe mansinge
That no man ne *touchi* thulke clerc, &c. R. Glou. 504.

33. — let hure be knowe
For ryche oþer well yrented. þauh hue *revely* for elde
Ther nys squier ne knyght. in contreye a boute
That he nel bowe to that bonde, to bede hure añ hosebonde
And wedden hure for hure welthe. Vis. de Dowel, pass. 1.

In ex. 32, 33, the verbs are mutilated.

The following examples illustrate the inflexions of the imperative:—

34. Jesu that was with spere y stounge
And for vs hard and sore y swounge
*Glady** (gladie) both old and younge
With wytte honest. Oct. 3.

35. — ȝoure fadres *honourieth*
Honora patrem et matrem, &c. Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 8.

36. And *take* þe my doȝter for mon þou art ywys
To wynne ȝet a kyndom. R. Glou. 13.

37. Whan thou doist almes, *knowe* not thi left hond what thi right hond doith.—Wicl. Matt. 6.

38. *Takith* heed that ye do not your rigtwisnesse before men to be seyn of hem.—Wicl. Matt. 6.

39. This vision is ȝet to drede *þink* and *gif* God kepe. R. Br. 66.

40. For *com* with me to Bretayne & thou schalt þere kyng be.
R. Glou. 90.

41. Thanne schalt thou come by a croft. ac *com* nat ther ynne.
Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 8.

The *i* form of the infinitive, *lovien* or *lovie,* still lingers among the dialects of the west of England. Jennings was the first to notice this curious fact (Obs. West Dial. p. 7), but his attempt to explain how the form originated was (as might have been expected) a failure.

42. Þow broghtest me borwes, my byddyng to fulfille
To lyve on me and *lovye* me. Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 2.

43. — that heo þider wende
To *wonye* and to live þere. R. Glou. 41.

44. — I wol fare
To Jerusalem ouer the flood
And *wonye* dare. Oct. 528.

45. David by hus daies. dobbede knyȝtes
And dude hem *swerye* in her swerde. to serve truthe evere.
Vis. de P. Plouh. pass. 2.

46. Ze mowe me *makie swerie* wat owe wille be
Ac inelle neuere the erche bessop in Engelond auonge.
R. Glou. 500.

47. — you'll come an *hâmaky* on't ye? eese I knaw you ool, &c.
Jennings, Thomas Came.

---

* The Anglo-Saxon did not take the *i* in the singular of the imperative; and perhaps even in the Old-English, *glade* would have been a more correct form than *glady*.

The infinitive in *ie*, as we have observed, is still in use throughout the west of England. But Barnes informs us that in Dorsetshire the verb takes this inflexion only "when it is absolute, and never with an accusative case;" *can ye zewy? wull ye zew up theos zeam?* (Diss. on the Dorset. Dialect, p. 28.) A tendency to restrict the use of this infinitive may be traced as early as the fifteenth century. There are only two instances in the Octovian in which it is followed by an accusative case.

The gerund was used as late as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

48. He ascode of his conselers wat was best *to done*. R. Glou. 127.

49. Therof haue thou no thing *to done*!
Arise vp quik and with me go
And do als tou sest me do. Seuyn Sages, 1256.

50. For þer nys in þi kyndom so wys mon y wys
To segge soþ of þinges þat *to comene* beþ. R. Glou. 145.

But in the later MSS. the *n* is generally found corrupted into *ng*.

51. Treuage als he asked of S. Edmonde þing
Þe corsaynt & þe kirke he þrette for *to brennyng*
And bot he had his askyng, þe lond he suld destroy. R. Br. 44.

52. And hopen þat he be to *comynge*. þat shal hem releeve
Moyses oþer Makemede. Vis. de Dobet, pass. 1.

53. — and the dragoun stood before the womman that was *to berynge child*, that whanne sche hadde borun child he schulde devoure hir sone. and sche bare a knaue child that was *to reulynge alle folkis*, &c.—Wicl. Apocalyps, 12.

The gerund thus corrupted seems gradually to have been confounded with the verbal noun in *ing*. In the phrase "what art thou *to doynge*"—what art thou going to do?—Wicl. Deedis, 22, the writer probably considered *doynge* as the dative case of *doyng* rather than as a corruption of the old gerund *done*.

The *nd* of the present participle was also very generally corrupted into *ng* before the close of the fourteenth century; but the older form was occasionally used in our literature as late as the seventeenth.

54. Thus she disputeth in hir thought
And wote not what she thynke maie
But *fastende* all the longe daie
She was, &c. Gower, 4. Berthollet's ed.

55. — with hys handes two
Clappynde togedere to and fro. Octov. 1346.

56. Als Jame the Second Roy of greit renoun
Beand in his superexcellent gloir, &c.
Lynds. Compl. of the Papingo.

57. In rhime, fine tinkling rhime & *flowand* verse,
With now & then some sense. B. Jons. Fortunate Isles.

The great peculiarity of our modern dialect, as distinguished from the Anglo-Saxon and the Old-English, is the rejection of the vowel of the final syllable*. But this principle will not account for such forms as *comþ, falþ, helpþ*, &c. In the very earliest stage of our

---

* *Vide* vol. i. p. 65.

language we find the inflexion joined immediately to the base; and there can be little doubt that we ought to rank these English forms with the Latin forms *fer-t* ,*vul-t*, *es-t*, &c., and with the Sanscrit verbs of the second conjugation. In like manner the English verbs which follow the *i* conjugation range themselves naturally with a large class of Latin verbs, which are chiefly comprised in the first, second and fourth conjugations, with the Greek circumflex verbs, and with the Sanscrit verbs of the fourth and tenth conjugations, both of which may be considered as interpolating the element *ya** between the ending and the base. The close connexion between these different classes of verbs may be seen in the great number of Anglo-Saxon verbs belonging to the *i* conjugation whose correlatives follow the corresponding conjugations in other languages. Thus we have *erian* to plough, arare; *temian* to tame, domare; *þunian* to rattle, tonare; *hilian* to cover, celare; *plantian* to plant, plantare; *borian* to bore, forare; *niwian* to renew, novare; *lician* to please, placere; *monian* to admonish, monere; *a-swefian* to put to rest, sopire; and we find *þolian* to suffer, answering to the Greek radical τλάω, and *yrsian* † to be angry, *lufian* to love, *cwiddian* to speak, &c., answering to the Sanscrit verbal roots, *rush* to be angry, *lub'* to covet, *gad* to speak, &c. Before we finish this more particular notice of the *i* conjugation, we may observe that its inflexions were generally given to those verbs which were introduced into the language from foreign sources during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In 'Langland's Visions' we find the following among other instances:—*to suffry, to honorie, to deviny, to labourie, to covetye, to comforty, to savy, to conquery*, &c. The inconsistent spelling of the final syllable—*ie, ye, y*—is due to the writer of Whitaker's MS.

Verbs which make the past participle end in *d*, form the preterite and participle in *ede, ed*, whenever the present tense follows the *i* conjugation, but in other cases generally form it in *de, d*.

Ind. Sing.	lovede	brende.
	lovedest	brendest.
	lovede	brende.
Plur.	loveden	brenden.
Subj. Sing.	lovede	brende.
Plur.	loveden	brenden.
Part.	loved	brend.

Instances of verbs forming the participle in *ed* and the preterite in *de*, though common in the Anglo-Saxon, very rarely occur in the Old-English.

Those verbs which make the past participle end in *n*, generally inflect their present tense like *come*; and perhaps we might add, that, with one exception, they never inflect it according to the forms of the

---

* In the opinion of the writer, this principle applies to the tenth no less than to the second conjugation. But the compass of a note does not allow space enough to discuss the question.

† The Anglo-Saxon *yrsian* differs merely by virtue of a letter-change from the Danish verb *rase* to be in a rage, and thus immediately connects itself with the Sanscrit root *rush*.

i conjugation. The exception alluded to occurs in southern MSS. (and sometimes in southern MSS. of late date), in which we often find the present tense *ich swerie,* I swear, used at the same time with the preterite *swor* and participle *sworn.*

The verbs we are now considering always form the preterite by a change in the vowel of the base. These letter-changes are amongst the oldest and the most important of our language. But satisfactorily to discuss their relations, and the place they fill in the history and development of our language, would require an examination of our vowel-system far exceeding the limits of this paper. We shall at present confine our attention to the personal endings of this tense, and to the change of vowel which in some of these preterites distinguishes the plural from the singular number.

Verbs whose preterite singular was distinguished by an *o*, or by an *a*, followed by some nasal, longest retained this change of vowel in the plural, the *o* being changed to *i*, as *smot, smiten,* and the *a* to *u*, as *ran, runnen.*

58. *Smoot.* And the men that heelden him scorniden him & *smyten* him, and thei blindfelden him and *smyten* him, and seiden areed thou Crist to us who is he that *smoot* thee.—Wicl. Luk 22.

59. Heo *smyten* þer a bataile, &c. R. Glou. 12.

60. *Roos.* And the prince of prestis *roos* and seide to him, &c.—Wicl. Matt. 26.

61. And summe of the farisees *risen* up and foughten seyinge, &c.—Wicl. Deedis, 23.

62. And the Brytones *a ryse* faste so þat þoru Godes grace
Heo hadde þe maistry of þe feld. R. Glou. 50.

63. *Risse* not the consular men & left their places
So soon as thou sat'st doun. B. Jons. Cataline.

64. *Droof.* And whanne he hadde maad as it were a scourge of smale cordis, he *droof* out alle of the temple & oxen & scheep, &c.—Wiclif, Jon 2.

65. Heo fonden a vewe geandes, for broide men as yt were
In to Cornewaile heo *drive* hem. R. Glou. 21.

66. *Ran.* — sche *ran* and cam to Symound Petir & to a nother disciple, &c. and thei tweyne *runnen* togidre and thilk othir disciple *ran* before Petir, &c.—Wicl. Jon 20.

67. *Began.* Anoon thei knewen him and thei runnen thorou al that cuntree and *begunnen* to bringe sik men, &c.—Wicl. Marc 6.

68. We preieden Tite (*i. e.* Titus) that as he *began* so also he parfourme in yhou this grace.—Wicl. 2 Cor. 8.

The proper ending of the second person singular of these preterites was *e*. The inflexion *st* at first belonged exclusively to the present tense, but it gradually intruded itself into the preterite, till it is now considered as the regular inflexion of the past tense. The vowel-inflexion was however used to a much later period than is generally supposed.

69. þoru þi traison luþer mon heor fader þou *slowe*
And þoru þi trayson Saxones into this lond þou *drowe*.
R. Glou. 133.

70. Thi brothers blood that thou *slewe*
Askyht vengeauns, &c. Cov. Myst. 38.

71. And thou, O Cassius, justly came thy fall,
That with the sword wherewith thou Cæsar *slew* (slowe)
Murdredst thyself. Sackville, Buckingham, 16.

72. Thou *sawe* thy child yslain before thin eyen.
Ch. M. of Lawes Tale, 838.

73. God of þy goodnesse *thou gonne* þe worlde make.
Vis. de P. Plouh. 116.

74. — have þis for þat. þo þat þou *toke*. Vis. de P. Plouh. 10.

75. þo *þou versoke* such travail, to be in God seruise
And wraþþedest so much God, thou ne dust noȝt as the wise.
R. Glou. 428.

76. Thys chyld thou neuer *begate*. Octov. 847.

Our language has always been more or less subject to conflicting usages. Even in the Anglo-Saxon the same verb sometimes took duplicate forms. Thus *sendan*, to send, has for the third person singular of its present tense both *sent* and *sendeþ*, just as in Latin *alo* has its two participles *altus* and *alitus*. There was also much uncertainty in the use of the *i* conjugation. This conjugation was unknown, during the Old-English period, to our Northern and Eastern dialects*, and as Northern forms gained ascendency in our literature, it gradually disappeared from the dialects of our Southern and Western counties. Chaucer never used it, and Langland only occasionally. It has long been unknown to our written language; in another generation the last relic of it will have vanished even from the language of the people.

---

* The forms of the *i* conjugation are sometimes found in the later Northern MSS., but were no doubt borrowed from the Southern literature of the day.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Vol. II. MAY 8, 1846. No. 47.

Rev. Richard Garnett in the Chair.

A paper was read:—

"On the Origin of certain Latin Words." By Professor Key.

The word *castra*, by the very fact of its being a plural with a translation as a singular, tells us that *camp* is not its original signification. The best mode of tracing a word to its original source, is to compare it with other words in the same tongue which have a similar termination. Now the singular *castrum* has a common ending with several Latin words, as *rastrum, rostrum, claustrum, plaustrum*. Of these the first three are evidently deduced from the several verbs *rado, rodo, claudo,* and as regards form, *plaustrum* also claims kindred with *plaudo*. The logical connexion between these two words is not self-evident, for although it must be admitted that the movement of a waggon is accompanied with great noise, yet this noise is not the object for which it is made, and therefore was but ill entitled to supply a name to the machine. Possibly however in the narrow roads of ancient Italy it was found important that a vehicle should have some artificial mode of making a noise in order to give notice of its approach to other vehicles moving in the opposite direction, and thus prevent two carriages entering a road whose width was not sufficient for them to pass each other. Even in the present day in the narrow cross-roads of France, each cart is for the same purpose often provided with a horn. Nor is the use of bells in waggons to serve a like object unknown in England. Be this suggestion correct or not, the example of the other words just quoted points our attention to the Latin verb *cado*. But again, a connexion of meaning does not readily present itself. The ideas of a *camp* and of *falling* are not directly related to each other. However, as has been just stated, it is not probable that *camp* was the original meaning of the word. The phrases *movere castra* and *ponere castra* have no intelligible sense if *castra* meant *walls* and *ditches*. But the simplest form of artificial defence against an enemy is an abattis, that is a wooden fence, formed by felling trees upon the spot. Now there is a close connexion between felling and falling, indeed the very terms are nearly identical, and what little difference there is between them disappears when we call to mind that the phrase *to fall a tree* is no less common in use, though not in dictionaries, than the more favoured phrase *to fell a tree*. Still there remains an insuperable difficulty in the fact that the suffix *trum* denotes always an instrument. Nor is it probable that an army when leaving one of these hasty fortifications would move away the trees which they cut for the occasion. They would rather trust to the probability of finding other trees for their purpose in their next position. *Castrum*, if connected with *cado*, must have signified the instrument for falling the trees, that is the axe. Axes would be required in very considerable quantities, and are precisely what the army would be called upon to carry with it, and they would be the very first articles taken from the *impedimenta* when the troops desired to encamp. Thus the power of the suffix *trum*, the connexion with *cado*, the use of the word in the plural, the peculiarities of the two phrases *ponere c.* and *movere c.*, and the sense of the word, are reconciled with each other. It may at the same time be useful to notice the double relationship between the English words *fall* and *fell* and the Latin *cado* and *caedo*. The last of these words is the right term for felling timber, and it is in all probability only a factitive form of the preceding verb *cado*. Some connexion between the words is strongly suggested by the allied significations of the very similar verbs *occĭdere* 'to die,' and *occīdere* 'to kill.' But we may perhaps proceed a step further, and assert that the two Latin words *cado* and *caedo* are the Latin *analogues* respectively of our English verbs *fall* and *fell*. The forms at first seem to have no similarity beyond the vowels. But if we call in aid the Greek πιπτω (now acknowledged to be formed upon the same model as μιμνω γιγνομαι and the Latin *sisto*, viz. by reduplication, as πι-πετ-ω from a base πετ), we shall have a triple form pervading the three tongues precisely parallel as regards the initial consonant to the fourth and fifth numerals.

πισυρες (*Aeol.*),	quatuor,	(fidvor) four.
πεντε (πεμπ-τος),	quinque,	(fünf) five.
πι-πετ-ω,	cado,	fall.

On the other hand, the convertibility of the final consonants *d* of *cad* and *l* of *fall* is more familiar in the Latin than in most languages, and the numeral series again furnishes an example, the *decem* of the Latin (as Bopp and others have shown) appearing in our own tongue with an *l* instead of a *d*, viz. in *e-leven*, that is *en-leven*. But the very form of our English verb *fall* is not unknown to the Latin and Greek tongues. In a recently published Greek Lexicon* occurs the passage—Σφαλλω, *to make to fall* (like Lat. *pedes fallere*, Liv. 21. 36).—Thus the moral notion of *deceiving* is in reality, as might be expected, only secondary in the Latin verb. But the same root *fall* may be traced perhaps in another Latin word. The substantives *fors, sors, ars, mors, gens, mens*, appear to have had in earlier times a disyllabic nominative, *fortis, sortis, artis, mortis*, &c. being formed by the addition of a suffix *ti* to a verbal base. In the case of the last four the required verbs present themselves without difficulty: αρ-ω, *mor-ior, gi-gen-o, me-min-i*. As regards the first of these four verbs, we need not confine ourselves to the Greek language, as the substantive *artus*, like all other nouns with a suffix *tu*, clearly points to a Latin verb. Now we would suggest that *fors* and *sors* in like manner are to be deduced from the verbs *fall-ere*

---

* Liddell and Scott's quarto edition.

and *sali-re*. As regards the former, it is almost a law of language that words signifying chance are deduced from words having the sense of 'to fall;' *chance* itself, for example, being formed through the French *chéance* from the verb *cheoir*, that is *cadere*. On the other hand, as the Roman practice of casting lots was to put small tablets into a narrow-necked pitcher of water and then give to the vessel a rapid circular motion, so that a tablet was expelled through the narrow neck, the idea of 'leaping out' may naturally have given to the lots a name derived from *sali-re**.

Prehendo has been noticed by Bopp in his 'Comparative Grammar' (p. 88, *note*), who suggests the possibility of its connexion with the Sanscrit root *grah*, through the ordinary interchange of guttural and labial letters. This derivation has the serious inconvenience of not accounting for the three letters *end*. It seems a more natural proceeding to look upon the first syllable as the preposition *prae*, robbed of its quantity, and therefore of its diphthongal form, in consequence of the next syllable beginning with the unpronounced *h*. The notion moreover expressed in the verb agrees with the ordinary signification of *prae* in composition, for the common use of *prehendo* is in the sense 'to take hold' of a thing by something that projects, as to take hold of a man by his arm, by his sleeve, &c. The second syllable of the word is just as much entitled to a vowel *a* as to a vowel *e*, seeing that *ascendo*, *incendo*, are compounds of *scando* and *cando*. Unfortunately the Latin language exhibits no root in the form *hand*. The deficiency however is supplied if we may have recourse to our own tongue in the substantive *hand*, which moreover is often used as a verb; and certainly the sense of our English noun is precisely in agreement with the meaning of the Latin *prehendo*. Still it would be more satisfactory to find what we are in search of within the limits of the Latin. Now the noun *manus*, as regards all but the initial consonant, stands in the proper relation to our own *hand*. The vowel is the same, and the addition of a *d* after the *n* is precisely what the idiom of our language demands, as is seen in the words *sound*, *thunder*, compared with the Latin *sona-re*, *tona-re*. The disappearance of the letter *m* from *manus* has its parallel in the Latin *mere-re* contrasted with *earn* in English. Here again the addition of an *n* after the *r* is a common occurrence, another example of which appears in the Latin *maere-re* contrasted with the Gothic *maurn-an* and English *mourn*. The fact that *earn* rather than *deserve* is the earlier signification of the Latin verb beginning with *mer* will account for the use of the perfect tense *meritus est* as a present, *he has earned*, therefore *he deserves*.

Obsoleo is commonly treated as a compound of *ole-o* 'grow'†. But those who support this view have two points to explain; first, how the signification superadded to the simple verb is in agreement

---

* The signification of the French *sortir*, 'to go out,' so evidently identical in origin with the Latin *sortiri*, is a strong argument in favour of the view here taken.

† *Abolere* and *exolescere* stand in a very different position from *obsolescere*, because the power of the prepositions *ab* and *ex* lend so material an aid to the signification of those verbs.

with the signification of the preposition; and secondly, a question of form, why the *s* has been interposed. That the prepositions which end in *b* at times attach to themselves a sibilant must be admitted; but the examples are confined to those cases where a *tenuis* consonant commences the verb, as in *asportare, abstuli, abscondo**. These two objections standing in the way of the usual derivation, it behoves us to look elsewhere, and to ask ourselves whether the *s* may not be an essential portion of the simple verb. Unfortunately the sense of the Latin verb *soleo* seems to be very different from what we should desire; but here again *to be accustomed* cannot well be the primitive meaning of the Latin word, because it is not a sufficiently simple, nor a physical notion. A very little consideration of the words which denote custom will show us that they originally denoted the act of *sitting*, which as contrasted with *standing*, denotes a greater degree of permanence. He who does not mean to remain says what he has to say standing, and that done goes off. On the contrary, he who requires much time to finish a matter, takes his chair and sits down. Hence it is that the Latin *assiduus*, 'sitting at it,' has obtained the meaning of permanence. The German language too in its substantive *sitte* 'custom,' has a word of similar origin. Now the Latin *solium* 'a seat,' like *studium, odium, imperium*, should be connected with a verb. The proposed translation of *solere* supplies such a verb. But the very conjugation of *solēre*, independently of its radical syllable, tends to express a permanent idea, since the third conjugation is particularly employed to express action, the second to express a state, *jacĕre* 'to throw,' *jacēre* 'to lie,' *sidĕre* 'to take a seat,' *sedēre* 'to remain seated.' Nor is the active verb corresponding to *solēre* wanting in Latin, for *consulere* in the older writers is written *consolere* or *cosolere*†; and its sense of *deliberation* is in the closest relationship to the idea of *sitting together*. But in fact the words containing the syllable *sed* in the sense of 'sit,' are closely related with those which appear in the form *sol*. The vowels *e* and *o* are at times interchanged, and the same is still more true of the consonants *d* and *l*. Hence *sedeo, sedes, sodalis, sella, subsellium, solium, consolere*, are all of one origin. A similar interchange of letters establishes the connexion of *metior, modus, modulus, modius, meditari, melos, μελεταω*. But to return to the verb *obsoleo*, our signification of the simple verb, together with a very ordinary sense of the preposition, give us an equivalent in power to the Latin verb *supersedeo*. The awkward point is, that the passive *supersedeor* would be more applicable. But here again the analogies of the Latin language furnish a solution. *Pendeo* is in power a passive as

---

* *Absens* may appear an exception to those who suppose the verb *esse* to be entitled to a participle *ens*. The essential part of the Latin substantive verb is now admitted to be the syllable *es*, so that the true participle should have been *esens*, in analogy with *regens*, and the fuller form *abesens* would naturally be compressed into *absens*. The same view accounts for the *s* in *praesens* and *Di Consentes*.

† A recently proposed etymology for *consulo* is, that it is a diminutive from a verb *conso*, whence *censeo*. But the diminutive verbs which end in *ulo* are of the first conjugation, and besides this, the alleged verb *conso* seems to be an unsafe foundation to build upon.

well as perfect of *pendo*, and *jaceo* the same of *jacio*, so that *ob-soleo* may fairly signify 'I am superseded,' that is, a new surface has been spread over and consequently concealed the old one.

In dealing with *consulere*, the attention is almost necessarily drawn to the substantive *consul*, which, like the verb, has for its older form *consol* or *cosol*. This word has been the subject of Niebuhr's remarks in his Roman History; but he treats the latter syllable as utterly unimportant. This seems contrary to the principles of etymology. The right course here as elsewhere is to collect the different words of the same termination. There are two such: *exul* and *praesul*. The latter is commonly derived from *salio*, as though it denoted the leader in the religious dance of the Salii. Without altogether denying this derivation, it may be asserted that in a majority of the passages where it occurs, the sense of *praeses* is much better suited, as may be seen in the Lexicon of Forcellini; and in the two passages in the 'De Divinatione,' where the other sense is preferred, the reading is doubtful. Then in reference to *exul* or *exsul*, the notion is precisely that of one who has no fixed abode in which to reside, *cui nulla est sedes*, just as *exlex* is one who has no law to protect him. Lastly, in the word *consul* the second syllable seems to admit a satisfactory interpretation in the same sense. The authority of the Roman kings was divided between the two leading officers of the republican constitution which supplanted the monarchy, and one of the consequences was that the *solium* or throne formerly occupied by the single sovereign, became now the joint seat of two chief magistrates*. They were therefore *consules* in the physical sense of that word, as well as in the sense of men deliberating together for the common welfare. In reference to their military duties, the suitable title was *praetor*=*prae-i-tor*, or *στρατηγος*, but the former was better adapted to denote their civil position.

Pluma.—Following the same course of investigation, we place together for review such words as *lacruma*, *fama*, *spuma*, *flama*, *squama*, *rima*. The first three are clearly connected with verbs, viz. *δακρυ-ειν*, *fa-ri*, *spu-ere*, and therefore naturally suggest a search for verbs whence the others may be deduced. Such are *φλεγ-ειν* (connected with the Latin *fulge-re*, *flagra-re*, &c.), *squale-re*, *rige-re*. The loss of a *g* before *m* has its parallel in the double form of *examen* for *exagmen* and in *fulmen* for *fulgmen*; and secondly, the loss of the *l* in *squama* between *a* and *m* is no more than is familiar to an English ear in *calm*, *qualm*, *balm*, &c. Moreover the suffix in question is well known in the Greek language, as in *τιμη*, *φημη*, &c. But with what verb is *pluma* connected? Now the Latin *pulmo* corresponds to the Greek *πλευμων*, according to the well-known principle which allows the letter *l* and other liquids to precede or follow their vowel almost indifferently. But this very syllable *πλευ* proves to be a verbal base, *πλευμων* being only another form of *πνευμων*, and therefore deduced from the verb *πνε-ειν*, or rather *πνεϜ-ειν*, *to*

---

* Just as the two Proctors at times are compelled to compress themselves into the seat usually occupied by the Vice-chancellor.

breathe. So much for the question of form. The second question is, does the notion of breathing accord with the peculiar signification of *pluma?* This question may perhaps be answered in the affirmative, seeing that *pluma* means in Latin, not the whole feather, for which *penna* or rather *pinna* is the proper word, but only the downy portion which is sent flying by the slightest puff of wind.

Jus.—The fact that a neuter noun in *us* is of monosyllabic form should not prevent a comparison of it with other neuters, such as *genus, decus, frigus, pondus,* &c., since such monosyllables often owe their brevity to a contraction. The Latin *crus* for example seems beyond all doubt to be the equivalent of the Greek σκελος, the λ becoming very readily a ρ when brought close up to the κ, as in καλυπτω compared with κρυπτω, or σκολοψ compared with the Latin *crux.* But such neuters as *genus, decus,* &c., are the majority of them traceable to verbs. We have therefore two principles to guide us in an examination of *jus,* viz. the resolution of it into two syllables, and this done, the detection of a verbal base in the resulting first syllable. Now the *i consonans,* as the Romans called it, which commenced a syllable, is often the corrupted produce of the sound *di,* followed by a vowel. The most familiar examples are *Jupiter* from *Diu-piter* or *Diespiter,* and *Janus* from *Dianus.* This would give us *dius,* the first syllable of which is nearly related in form to the Greek δε-ω 'bind.' The Latin *dica-re* 'to bind,' in the legal sense, is the very same word, as also our English *tie, tight.* Of these four words, two have lost the guttural in orthography, and all but one in pronunciation, so that we need not be surprised at its disappearance in the supposed *dius* for *dicus.* Nay, the very same degradation has occurred in the French *lier* from *ligare,* itself only a dialectic variety of *dicare,* according to that interchange of *d* and *l* which has been more than once adverted to in this paper. That the sense of a legal or moral binding is conveyed in the term *jus* 'right,' will be readily admitted, and other arguments in favour of the view present themselves in the form and signification of the Greek δικη, and the Latin *licere* and *lex.* The word *lis* also may possibly belong to the same root, seeing that its original nominative must have been *litis* to justify a plural genitive *litium,* and thus, like *mors* and the words already spoken of, it seems to point to a verb as its origin. It may be difficult to connect the meaning of *lis* with that of *ligare,* but as regards form there is no difficulty. The guttural of this root we have already seen is apt to disappear, and there must have been a time when the letter *a* formed no part of the verb; in other words, the verb must at one time have belonged to the third conjugation in the form *ligĕre.* Such a passage from the third to the first conjugation has occurred repeatedly in the Latin language. For example, all those verbs of the first conjugation which form their perfects and supines in what is called an irregular manner, in *ui ĭtum,* owe those forms to an earlier verb of the third conjugation, and in truth such forms as *sonunt,* &c. occur in the fragments of the older writers. Most probably the process was this: from such verbs as *son-ĕre, plec-ĕre (plectere),* were formed in the first instance nouns like *sonus, plica,* and then from the latter the denominative verbs *sonare, plicare.* But to return to the verb *ligare,* there are several words in the Latin language which bear evidence in favour of an earlier form *lig-ĕre,* viz. *limen, lictor* and *lignum.* To begin with the first of these, the syllable *men* is well known as a neuter suffix attached to verbs, and the meaning of *limen* readily connects itself with the notion of the verb we have been discussing, for there were two *limina* to a door, the *limen superius* or lintel, and *limen inferius* or threshold. Both these pieces of wood fulfil the office of what an English carpenter calls a *tie,* that is, a horizontal piece of timber employed to keep the other timbers, more particularly those which are vertical, from falling in or bulging out. The noun *lictor* has also a suffix which is commonly attached to verbs, and as to the meaning, it is sufficient to call to mind the ominous words *I lictor colliga manus,* by which the dictator or consul called upon his attending officer to perform one of his ordinary duties, and indeed that very duty which is implied in the symbols of his office, namely the fasces and secures, to say nothing of the rope around those fasces, by which the hands of the offender were bound together, and which would be first in requisition. The word *lignum* remains. This has a form parallel to that of *signum,* which in all probability comes from *dicere* 'to point or show,' for such seems to have been the earlier meaning of that verb. Its older form, we know, was *deicere,* so that the essential syllable was letter for letter the same with the base of the Greek δεικ-νυμι. This root is admitted to be the same with that of the German verb *zeig-en* and noun *zeichen,* to which the English words *show* and *token* respectively correspond. The words *dei-cere,* δεικ-νυμι, and *zeigen, zeichen,* and *token,* in their initial letters obey the well-known law of Grimm, of which we have another familiar example in *decem,* δεκα, *zehn* and *ten.* But the letter *s* also occasionally supplies the place of the other dentals in the present root, so that we have in Greek ση-μα, *i. e.* σεγ-μα, in Latin *signum,* and in English *show.* The derivation of *signum* from a verb suggests the same course for *lignum.* Now this word is commonly used in the sense of firewood, and the ordinary term for a load of firewood is a *cord* of it, that is, as much as is *bound* together on one timber-waggon.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Vol. II. MAY 22, 1846. No. 48.

Hensleigh Wedgwood, Esq., in the Chair.

Egidius Benedictus Watermeyer, Esq., was elected a Member of the Society.

A paper was then read:—

"On certain Initial Letter-changes in the Indo-European Languages," *continued*. By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

In a former paper an attempt was made to illustrate some of the affinities of the Greek digamma, on the theory of its origination in a fuller or more complex sound than the one usually attributed to it. It is at present intended to apply the same mode of investigation to the liquids, several of which exhibit phænomena bearing considerable analogy to those already noticed with regard to the digamma and its various representatives.

With respect to the letter *l*, Grimm and other German philologists observe that it is the least variable of all sounds, especially at the beginning of words. It is true that in the languages usually compared with each other, *l* as an initial is seldom replaced by any other simple consonant. The Sanscrit affords examples of interchange between *l* and *r*: e.gr. *lōhita* and *rōhita*, red; *lōman* and *rōman*, hair; but they are not numerous. If however we take a more comprehensive induction, and inquire at the same time whether the ordinary *l* of the Greek, Latin, and Teutonic languages may not occasionally be represented by a more complex sound, we shall discover phænomena which at all events appear to deserve a careful investigation. We may observe as a preliminary to the present inquiry, that an Englishman or German is apt to take a limited view of the subject, because he only knows of one power of the letter *l*, and naturally supposes that the same is the case in all other languages. This however would be a very erroneous impression. The Armenian, for example, has two perfectly distinct elements: one, at least in the modern language, answering to the ordinary English or Latin *l*, and another, which, whatever may have been its ancient pronunciation, has now assumed that of *gh*, guttural. Several Slavonic dialects have also two distinct *l*'s; the difference between them is not however easily rendered intelligible through the medium of our own language. The Welsh also possesses a twofold element of this class: one secondary, that is, only employed in construct or compound words, and not differing in power from the same character in our own language; and another primary, usually, for want of a better sign, written *ll*.

This character, invariably used at the beginning of words not in grammatical construction, is sometimes erroneously compared to the initial *ll* in Span. *llano, llamar*, &c. It has however a totally different power, bearing nearly the same relation to a simple *l* that our *th* does to *t*: indeed it is sometimes described by Englishmen as equivalent to *thl*; but though this combination approximates in some degree to the sound, it contains too much of a dental admixture. Though the same sound has not as yet been found in any other language, there is no doubt of its great antiquity; and it is believed that the existence of it in Welsh may serve as a clue for the explanation of certain apparent anomalies in other tongues.

It is scarcely necessary to say, that when people attempt to express articulations difficult or impracticable to their vocal organs, they try to represent them by the best substitutes that they can find. Englishmen, when they employed Welsh proper names learnt by the ear, were aware that their own simple *l* conveyed no adequate idea of *ll*, and the common resource was to employ *fl* in the place of it. Thus Shakspeare's Fluellin is merely a Saxon transformation of Llewelyn, and the surname Floyd, which has now become fixed, is nothing more than Llwyd or Lloyd, adapted, or attempted to be adapted, to English organs. Now if we suppose that the sound of the Welsh *ll*, or a still older articulation out of which it was formed, existed in the parent language of the Indo-European class, and was gradually disused by various tribes in the course of their divergence from the original stock, it is obvious that substitutes would be employed for it, varying according to circumstances. Some nations might express it in one way, and some in another, but all would endeavour to convey an idea of the original sound as nearly as their vocal organs permitted them.

If therefore we take the known English instances of *Floyd* and *Fluellin* as a criterion, we might expect to find other and still older examples of the same substitution. The following list of words, which might be greatly augmented, appears to give some countenance to this supposition:—

llab, stroke	*flap*.
llac, slack, relaxed	*flaccidus*, Lat.
llawr, area	*floor*.
llawv, palm of the hand	*folme*, Ger.
llawr, many	*fleira*, Isl.
lletty, dwelling	*flett*, Anglo-Sax.
luath, Gael., swift	*fliotr*, Isl.; *fleet*, Eng.

Sometimes, by an easy change, *b* or *p* appear instead of *f*.

llachiaw, to beat, lick	*plaga*, L.; *placu*, *I strike*, Lith.
llawn, full	*plenus*.
leach, Bret., place	*plecus*, Lith.; *pleck*, Lanc.
ledan, broad, Lat. latus	πλατὺς; *platus*, Lith.
lyja, it rains, Lith.	*pluit*, Lat.
λούω, I wash	*plauju*, *I rinse*, Lith.
lein, Bret., summit	*blaen*, W.
llian, linen	*bliant*, O.-Eng., *fine linen*, &c.

Sometimes a vowel seems to be inserted, in order to facilitate the pronunciation:—

llavar, speech	*palabra*, Span.
llawv, palm, Gael. lamh, hand	παλάμη.

This resolution into a liquid preceded by a labial is by no means the only one which the class of words under consideration appears to admit of. It has already been observed, that one of the Armenian letters related to *l* has in more recent times assumed the sound of *gh*. A similar phænomenon is presented by the Spanish language, in which the Latin *li* not unfrequently becomes a pure guttural, as in *muger* from *mulier*, and *hoja* from *folium*. Μόλις and μόγις exhibit the same species of affinity; it is therefore not surprising to find words commencing with *l* in one dialect, in another exhibiting this element in connexion with *c*, *g*, or *k*. A few examples will show the matter in a clearer light.

llavar, speech	*klavre*, Dan., *to prate*.
llai, mud	*clay*.
llais, voice	*glas*, Slav.
llathru, to shine	*glitter*.
llawd, a youth	*glott*, O.-Swed.
llavn, blade	*glafwen*, O.-Swed., *a lance*.
læccan, A.-S., to seize	*glacaim*, Gael.
laikau, Lith., I hold.	
luppu, Lith., I strip.	*glubo*, Lat.

There is a still further modification of this element, perhaps more extensively prevalent than any of the others. The Welsh *ll* has a sort of sibilant sound, easily reducible to *sl* by organs unable to pronounce it or the English *th*, as is notoriously the case with most of the Indo-European nations. Accordingly we find that words with this initial frequently reappear in Gaelic and Teutonic under the form *sl*, or, in the modern German, *schl*, as will appear from the following instances:—

llaciaw, to beat	*slacair*, Gael.
lladyr, theft	*slad*, —
llai, mud	*slaib*, —
llath, rod, lath	*slat*, —
llovyn, lock of hair	*slamhagan*,—
llwyvan, an elm	*sleamhan*, —
llu, host, army	*sluagh*, —
llivaw, to grind	*schleifen*, Germ.
llawg, swallowing	*schlucken*, —
llarp, rag	*slarfwa*, O.-Swed.

The above examples, to which many others might be added, appear to establish the fact, that words with the initial *l* are liable to have this element modified by a labial, guttural or sibilant prefix. It is not perhaps possible, with our present means of information, to lay down any single rule, capable of accounting for all those modifications. It might be conjectured that the forms with prefixes are the more original, and that the Welsh *ll* for example represents several distinct classes of conjunct consonants, in the same way as the Spanish *llamar, llama* and *llaga* are respectively to be referred to *clamare, flamma* and *plaga*. It is however a serious objection to this theory that the same root not unfrequently appears under all the different forms, and has sometimes a twofold aspect even in the same dialect.

Thus besides *llab*, a stroke or blow, we have the forms *clap, flap, slap*; Germ. *klopfen*, to beat; Slavon. *klepati*: along with the Germ. *lau*, lukewarm, we have W. *clauar*; Gr. *χλίαρος*; Belg. *flauw*; O.-Swed. *flia*, to thaw; and along with W. *llwfr*, E. *lubber*, appear the O.-Swed. *flepr*, Gael. *sliobair*, in the same sense. Again, it might be supposed that the simple liquid sound is the original one, and that the labials, gutturals and sibilants are distinct prefixes, bearing some analogy to prepositions, and having formerly a distinct meaning which cannot now be traced. This is undoubtedly possible, and might be supported to a certain extent by actual examples. We know that the Anglo-Saxon *blinnan*, to cease, and Germ. *bleiben*, to remain, are no simple verbs, but compounds of *bi-linnan* and *bi-liban*; and in the Slavonic dialects an immense number of words, commencing with *sl* or *vl*, require the removal of the initial in order to arrive at the real root.

There are however many cases in which it would be unsafe to apply this solution. Supposing the Armenian *lou* or *lov*, a flea, to be a genuine original form, it is not likely that it should be transformed into *floh, blocha, pulex* and *ψύλλα*, without any visible reason or change of meaning, by means of a prefix with which it could very well have dispensed. Again, the Arm. *lŭsel*, to hear or listen, has in other languages the counterparts *klu, hlu, shlu, sru*, while in the Pali and in certain Greek forms, the supposed radical liquid entirely disappears, *e. gr.* Pali *suyatè*, he is heard = Gr. *ἀκούεται*. It appears much more likely, *à priori*, that all these forms are organic modifications of the same primitive root, than that they should be compounds, made out of different elements, in languages closely related to each other.

If one might venture to hazard a conjecture on a point respecting which there is confessedly no evidence beyond that afforded by an inductive comparison of forms, it would be a suggestion analogous to that lately proposed respecting the digamma and its cognates, namely, that none of the known forms are, strictly speaking, original; but that all have branched out of some still older element, capable, according to known phonetic laws, of producing them all. It has been shown that the archetype of the digamma, whatever it was, has given birth to labials, hard and soft, gutturals, palatals, and sibilants; and that the Welsh *ll* has within the last few centuries been resolved into *fl*: it is therefore very possible that it may itself be the descendant of a stronger and fuller sound, capable of being modified in various ways. The comparison of a few cognate forms may serve as a groundwork for an attempt to reduce the varieties to one standard.

The Latin *lis, litis*, corresponds pretty accurately in form with W. *llid*, anger, strife; and with these the Anglo-Saxon *flytan*, to scold, quarrel, and the Lettish *kilda*, strife, may very well have affinity, according to analogies already pointed out. In like manner *locus* agrees regularly with Bret. *leach*, with which Lith. *plecus* and Lancash. *pleck* appear to be cognate. But further, Quintilian has preserved two remarkable archaic forms, *stlis* and *stlocus*, initial combinations of which there is only one other example in Latin, viz. *stlatarius*, apparently connected with *latus*. Now, assuming a primitive articulation bearing some analogy to the Welsh *ll*, but with a certain admixture of the guttural element, it is not difficult to conceive that *flytan* might be evolved from it in the same way as Floyd has sprung from Lloyd; *kilda*, according to the analogy of O.-Swed. *glafwen* from W. *llavn*, and *stlis*, like *slarfwa* from W. *llarp*. The insertion of the dental may be explained on the principle of euphony, the combination *sl* not being tolerated in Latin. A parallel instance occurs in Fr. *esclave, Esclavonie*, where the guttural is not radical, but inserted to prevent the collision of *s* and *l*. Benfey compares Germ. *streiten*, to strive, and Sanscr. *srīni*, an enemy; if the latter is really cognate, it would furnish another argument against the originality of the dental in *stlis* and *stlocus*.

The synonyms for *milk* show a still greater variety of forms, all of which are however reducible to one origin. Lat. *lac*; W. *llaeth, blith*; Gael. *bligh*; Gr. γλάγος, γάλα; Slav. *mliek*; A.-S. *meolc*; Lat. *mulgeo*, I milk; Lith. *melzu*; Gr. ἀμέλγω. Respecting the interchange of *b* and *m* as initials, compare Sanscr. *brū*, Zend *mrū*, Bohem. *mluwiti*, to speak; Sanscr. *mritas*, Gr. βρότος, a mortal; with many others.

The above examples, selected from a much greater number, show, it is conceived, that Pictet was far from being justified in broadly stating that the Celtic *l* accurately corresponds with the Sanscrit one (including of course the other cognate dialects) in every situation. It is believed, on the contrary, that few elements are capable of a greater variety of modifications, for the view we have just taken by no means exhausts the subject. Many instances might be given of *l* being completely vocalized, or converted into an articulation of a class totally distinct from its own; but they do not so properly belong to the present division of our subject, which professes only to treat of the modifications of initial sounds. It is presumed that enough has been advanced to show that the scale of permutations in the Indo-European languages, as laid down by Grimm and Pott, will admit of being considerably extended beyond the limits which they have assigned; and that it is very unsafe to fix upon Sanscrit or any other known language as a model to which all others are to be referred. It is believed that there are numerous phænomena in language of which neither Sanscrit, Greek, Teutonic, nor all in conjunction, can furnish a satisfactory solution; and that the real original articulations of speech have in many cases yet to be ascertained. This can only be attempted by a copious induction of all known varieties of cognate forms, and all that we can rationally expect to achieve is an imperfect approximation to the truth.

The following examples may serve as further illustrations of the subject. In some instances the affinity of the words in juxtaposition is only conjectural.

llachar, gleam, glitter	*flicker.*
lladd, to kill	*clades*, Lat. *klatĭ*, Slav., *occidere.*
llavyn, a slice	*sliver*, Prov.
llag, lazy, remiss	*flag ; slug.*
llai, dusky, blue	*blau* ? Germ.
llai, little	*klein* ? —
llain, strip of land	*slang*, Prov.
llaiv, a shearing	*clip.*
llanc, a youth	*floc'h*, Bret. *flunkie* ? Sc., *a footman.*
llaw, a hand	*claw* ? —
llawnt, N.-E. lawnd, a lawn	*cluain*, Gael.
lleb, pale yellow	*gelb* ? Germ.
llech, flat stone	*flag* ; *clach*, Gael.
lleddyv, inclining, sloping	*hleoð*, A.-S., *hill, steep.*
llegiad, a clasping	πλέκω ?
lleibiaw, to lick, lap	*slobber.*
lletty, a lodging	*kliet*, Slavon.
llethu, to press flat	*flatten* ?
llipan, smooth	*glib.*
llipa, flaccid	*flabby.*
llipyr, smooth	*glaber*, Lat.
llithraw, to slip	*slidder*, Prov. *glida*, Swed., *to slide.*
lliw, colour	*bleo*, A.-S. ; *blee*, O.-E.
lluched, lightning	*bliccettung*, A.-S.
llumon, chimney	*dluimh*, Gael., *smoke.*
llw ; llwv, an oath	*fluch*, Germ. *kl'nu*, Slav., *I curse.*
llwg, eruption, tumour	*blotch.*
llwry, precipitate	*flurry.*
llwy, a spoon	*slöv*, Dan.
llyffanu, to hop	*hlaupan*, Goth., *to leap.*
llygad, an eye; locan, A.-S., to look	*bliga*, Swed., *to look.*
llym, sharp	*fleam* ? *a cattle-lance.*
llymry, a preparation of oatmeal	*flummery.*

The following words, from various languages, are added for the sake of further comparison:—

lam, A.-S., lame	*cloff*, W. ; *chrom*, Slavon.
lank	*slank*, Belg. ; *schlank*, Germ.

laidoju, Lith., I bury	*claddu*, W. *slatten*, Fries., *to excavate.*
leimen, Germ., to besmear.	*claim*, Yorksh.
lekiu, Lith., I fly	*fliegen*, Germ.
limpu, Lith., adhæreo	*kleben*, Germ.
lippu, Lith., scando	*climb.*
λᾶας, a stone	*clach*, Gael.
λάπαρος, weak	*clav*, W.; *slab*, Slavon.
lisp	*bloesgi*, W.; *blæsus*, Lat.
lithe, soft, tender	*blydd*, W.
leoman, A.-S., to shine	*gleam.* *flimmern*, Germ.
lætus, Lat.	*blithe*, *glad.*

There are moreover a multitude of words in which the original affinity has been still further obscured by the elision of the liquid. The examination of these does not, however, so properly belong to the present branch of our inquiries.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. II. JUNE 12, 1846. No. 49.

Professor KEY in the Chair.

A paper was read—

"On Mistakes in the Use of Obsolete Greek Words by Attic Writers." Part II. By Professor Malden.

Professor Malden's former contribution on this subject (vol. ii. No. 29) gave rise to certain criticisms contained in a paper communicated by the Rev. G. C. Renouard, and entitled "Remarks on certain Doubtful Constructions found in the Works of Attic Writers" (vol. ii. No. 43). In answering critical observations suggested by a preceding paper, the Professor thought it would be inexpedient to notice any new matter that might be introduced—otherwise the series of replies might become endless—and therefore purposely confined his attention to the concluding paragraph.

In speaking of the interpretation of Æsch. Prom. V. v. 557, it was stated, "Lastly, with respect to *ἰότης*, Professor Malden explains it, as the old Greek Lexica do, by *βουλῄ*." The Professor wished to observe, in the first place, that he did *not* speak of a nominative form *ἰότης* (except in quoting from Mr. Linwood's Lexicon to Æschylus), because the nominative does not occur in any old Greek; but of the dative form *ἰότητι*, which does occur frequently in Homer; and this he considered to be not a futile distinction, since he was speaking of an obsolete noun, and trying to show that a case of it was used as a preposition. In the second place, he did *not* explain the word by *βουλῄ*. He gave no Greek synonym, but translated *ἰότητι* (as used by Homer) "by the purpose," "by the device," "by the contrivance." He went on to state, "Apollonius (Rhodius) uses it, not strictly according to Homeric precedent, but without any wide departure from it as to sense, treating it as an ordinary noun synonymous with *βουλῄ*:" and he considered that these words implied that he did not look upon *βουλή* as an exact synonym. Mr. Renouard's friend proceeds, "*For* if it were connected with *ἰὸς*, 'an arrow,' and derived from *ἴω*, 'I send,' it would mean: 1. the act of sending; 2. the design, and be *ἰότης*. The chief difficulty however in this derivation is, that all nouns in *-ότης* are formed from adjectives." From the way in which this derivation is introduced, as a reason for the explanation said to have been given of the word, it might be thought that the derivation was suggested in the Professor's paper; but he laid no claim to it, nor to the invention of the verb *ἴω*. The critic proceeds, "Hence *ἰότης* has been explained by an anonymous editor, whom Griffiths has silently followed, *one-ness*; as he probably derived it from the obsolete *ἰὸς*, *one* (whose feminine *ἰὰ* [*ἴα*] is found in Homer)." This is a specious etymology. Professor Malden was not aware that it had occurred to any one else; but it had passed through his own mind; and if the word *ἰότητι* had occurred only with a plural genitive, as in the frequent phrase *ἰότητι θεῶν*, he would probably have explained it accordingly, and have interpreted that phrase, " by the union," or " by the joint will of the gods." But though he did not think it worth while to stop to discuss an etymology which did not satisfy him, and which he did not know had ever been suggested, yet he indicated the difficulty which prevented his acceding to it, by observing expressly that the word is constructed " with a singular noun as well as with a plural, as *κακῆς ἰότητι γυναικός* (Od. λ. 383)." The same difficulty is presented by the use of the word in Il. O. 41, *μὴ δι' ἐμὴν ἰότητα*, &c. The critic goes on to say, " It is however difficult to understand why the Professor should have translated *ἀμφὶ λουτρὰ καὶ λέχος σὸν ὑμεναίουν ἰότητι γάμων*, in Prom. 571, 'I hymned at the ablutions and your bed on account of the marriage.' For as *ὑμεναιοῦν* is a verb transitive, it must have its object, and hence we must read with the anonymous editor, *ἰότητα*, 'At the ablutions and around your bed I hymned the oneness of marriage.' " The Professor did not understand why the writer should assert that he translated the passage in any particular way, when in fact he never translated it at all. He translated the two words *ἰόταπι γάμων*, 'on account of your marriage,' but gave no translation of the rest of the passage; and if the writer had looked to the Greek which was printed at length, he might have seen that the word or words before *ἀμφὶ λοετρὰ* were printed, not as *ὅτε*, *when*, but as *ὅ τε* (with a space between the two parts), the neuter of the relative pronoun *ὅς τε* with its antique suffix, which is the reading of two MSS., of the Aldine and Glasgow editions, and of Wellauer. If therefore the passage had been translated, it would have been rendered, " *Which* I sang as a hymeneal song around the bath and thy bed on account of thy marriage," and thus would have been given to *ὑμεναίουν* the object which the commentator says that it requires. But upon examining the passage again, it may be doubted whether *ὑμεναίουν*, as it is used here, be a verb transitive. The verbs in *όω* or *οῦν*, though generally transitive, are not so without exception. For example, *μεσοῦν* is always intransitive, and *ἐξισοῦν* is used intransitively by Sophocles (Elect. v. 1194) and Thucydides (vi. 87), and *παρισοῦν* by Aristophanes (Vesp. v. 565). Now the verb *ὑμεναιοῦν* is used by Aristophanes (Pac. vv. 1041, 1078) and by Theocritus (Id. xxii. 179), and in this passage; and as it would seem, not elsewhere. In Aristophanes and Theocritus it means " to wed," and is transitive (Ar. Pac. *πρίν κεν λύκος οἶν ὑμεναιοῖ*, and Theoc. *ὑμεναιώσουσι δὲ κούρας*); but here the sense is quite different. The 'Etymologicum Magnum' explains the word—*καὶ ὑμεναιοῦν, τὸ ᾄδειν τὸν ὑμέναιον, καὶ συνάπτειν γάμῳ.* The former interpretation belongs to this passage, and to this passage only; and it appears to be allowable to read *ὅτε ὑμεναίουν*, and to translate it, " *When* I was singing the hymeneal song." On the whole however the old reading seems preferable, which gives the verb an accusative case.

As his attention had been recalled to the subject, the Professor wished to point out some other instances, in which it seemed to him that Attic writers had departed from the proper use of words belonging to the older language.

I. In the Œdipus in Colonus of Sophocles, when Œdipus hears the ominous thunder which announces his approaching end, he exclaims (v. 1458, ed. Hermann)—

> *ὦ τέκνα, τέκνα, πῶς ἄν, εἴ τις ἔντοπος,*
> *τὸν πάντ' ἄριστον δεῦρο Θησέα πόροι;*

It is plain that these words express a wish that some one would fetch Theseus, that is, *cause him to come* to Œdipus. A little further on in the play he exclaims again (v. 1474)—

> *— ἀλλ' ὡς τάχιστά μοι μολὼν*
> *ἄνακτα χώρας τῆσδέ τις πορευσάτω.*

And there can be little doubt that Sophocles used *πόροι* in the former passage as synonymous with *πορεύσειε*. This explanation of the passage is given in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon.

Now the verb *ἔπορον*, of which only this second aorist is found in use, is a word of the very old Epic language. It is not found, it is believed, in any poet later than Hesiod, until we come to Pindar; and although it was used by Æschylus and Sophocles, it was quite obsolete to the living speech of Athens. Not only is it not found in Attic prose, but even Euripides does not use it. The universal meaning of the word in Homer and Hesiod is *gave*, or *presented*. It is most commonly used of making a free gift, as a mark of friendship or esteem. But it appears impossible to interpret the word in its genuine old meaning of *give* or *present* in the phrase *πῶς ἄν τις δεῦρο Θησέα πόροι*; where it is connected with *δεῦρο*, *hither*. By the force of the context it must signify *bring*, *fetch*, or *send*.

Now it seems probable that Sophocles was induced to give this meaning to the word, and make it synonymous with *πορεύσειε*, on account of its apparent resemblance to *πορεύω* and *πορεύομαι*, and the noun *πόρος* from which they are derived. *Πόρος* is *a passage* or *way through*, and *πορεύω* is *fetch*, *bring*, *convey*, *cause to pass*, and the passive *πορεύομαι*, *journey* or *travel*. Modern etymologists have connected *ἔπορον* with *πόρος*; and even in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon a reference is made to *πόρος* (in its secondary sense, as "the *ways and means* of effecting an object," the sense in which *πορίζω*, *procure* or *furnish*, is derived from it), in order to explain the meaning of *ἔπορον*.

It happens however that the identity of the syllable *πορ* in the two forms is the decisive proof that they are not derived from the same root. The noun *πόρος* with its derivatives is one of that large family of words, the root of which appears in its simplest form in the Latin preposition *per*. The same root *περ* is the root of the Greek verb *πείρω*, *I pierce*, lengthening its vowel in the present tense; and *πόρος* is the derivative masculine noun, bearing the same relation to *πείρω* as *τόνος* to *τείνω*, *φθόρος* to *φθείρω*, *λόγος* to *λέγω*, &c. The primitive meaning of *πόρος* is seen most distinctly, when *πόροι* is used for the *pores* of the skin; but it is used for any *passage* or *way through*; and metaphorically for the ways and means of effecting an object. *Πορεύω* is a derivative from it in its physical sense; *πορίζω*, *ἄπορος*, *ἀπορέω*, &c. in its metaphorical sense. But although it is a law of the Greek language, that a verbal root, of which the vowel is *ε*, changes *ε* into *ο* in masculine and feminine substantives, and in adjective forms, with vowel terminations, it is equally certain that *ε* cannot become *ο* in a second aorist. In monosyllabic roots ending in a liquid, *ε* becomes *α* in a second aorist if it undergoes any change. *'Εγενόμην* and the Attic form *ἔτεμον* retain the *ε*; but according to a more common analogy, the root *περ* would become *παρ* in a second aorist, as in *ἀναπαρείς*, 2 aor. pass. part. from *ἀναπείρω*, Herod. iv. 94, just as *κτείνω* makes *ἔκτανον*. It is true that from the root *περ* a secondary verbal form might have been derived, in which the vowel would have undergone the same change as in the noun *πόρος*, viz. a form *πορέω*, which would have stood in the same relation to *πείρω* as *φορέω* to *φέρω*, *ὀχέω* to *ἔχω*, *σκοπέω* to *σκέπτομαι*, *φοβέω* to *φέβομαι*, *πονέω* to *πένομαι*, &c. Some Lexicons, *e. g.* Schrevelius, set down *πορέω* as an actual word: but even if it occurred, which it does not, such a derivative form could never have a second aorist.

It follows therefore that the second aorist *ἔπορον* is not from the root *περ*, and consequently is not connected in etymology and meaning with *πόρος* and its derivatives. In *ἔπορον*, *πορ* must be taken as the root, the *ο* being the original vowel, and not having been substituted for any other; as *θορ* and *μολ* are the roots in the second aorists *ἔθορον*, *I leaped*, and *ἔμολον*, *I came*. These verbs have the present tenses *θρώσκω* and *βλώσκω*; but *ἔπορον* has no present extant. If it were necessary to search further for the ultimate root of *ἔπορον*, we might be inclined to connect it with the preposition *πρό*. This root may suffer a transposition, as in the forms *πόρσω* and *πόῤῥω*, which are identical with *πρόσω*. In Liddell and Scott's Lexicon the perfect forms *πέπρωται* and *πεπρωμένος* are connected with *ἔπορον*, instead of being formed from *περατόω*, according to the absurd grammatical tradition preserved in the old Lexicons. Whether they be so connected or not, it seems clear that *πέπρωται* is derived from *πρό* as certainly as *πρῶτος* is, and that it means, "*It is predestined.*" If *ἔπορον* is also derived from *πρό*, which is not equally clear, it is derived from the preposition in a different meaning. In *πέπρωται* or *πεπρωμένος* the radical preposition means *before*, in relation to time: in *ἔπορον* it will mean *before* in relation to place; and *ἔπορον* will mean *I placed before*, or *I presented*, in the strict etymological sense of the verb *present*. It should however be observed, that the negative argument, which shows that *ἔπορον* is not connected with *πόρος*, is complete in itself, and quite independent of this positive speculation as to its etymology.

II. In Œd. Col. v. 134, Sophocles uses an active form *ἅζοντα* in the sense in which Homer uses a middle or passive form *ἅζομαι*, *ἁζόμενος* :—

> — *τὰ δὲ νῦν τιν' ἥκειν λόγος οὐδὲν ἅζονθ',*
> *ὃν ἐγὼ*, &c.;

"but now there is a report that some one is come, feeling no reverence, whom I, &c." These are the words of the Chorus, who are informed that a wandering stranger has trespassed upon the inviolable grove of the Furies. *Ἅζομαι* is an old poetic word, obsolete in the common language. Æschylus uses it in Choric passages (Suppl. 639, Eumen. 367, 956), and Sophocles himself in Œd. T. 155. Here however Sophocles has substituted for it the active form *ἅζω*. This is remarkable, as *ἅζομαι* is merely a deponent verb in the older poets, and *ἅζω* occurs nowhere but in this passage. There are many verbs, no doubt, in which the active form is found occasionally used in the sense which belongs more properly to the middle or passive. But it is not possible to substitute the active for the middle or passive in all verbs indiscriminately. The substitution is most easy where the active verb is properly transitive and causative, and where the middle or passive verb is immediate. In such a case the causative form is used as immediate, and the phrase is generally explained by grammarians as if the accusative of the reflexive pronoun, *ἑαυτόν*, &c., were understood; and so the active verb becomes equivalent to a middle verb in which the action returns directly upon the agent. Thus *παύειν* is sometimes used for *παύεσθαι*, and *ὁρμᾶν* for *ὁρμᾶσθαι*. But where the passive or middle verb is constructed with an accusative case as its direct object, it is frequently impossible to substitute the active. *Φοβεῖν τοὺς λύκους* cannot be used for *φοβεῖσθαι τοὺς λύκους*. The one is necessarily "to frighten the wolves," and the other "to be afraid" of them. *Αἱ θυγατέρες ἐκόπτοντο τὸν πατέρα* is very good Greek to express, "the daughters beat themselves in mourning for their father;" but *αἱ θυγατέρες ἔκοπτον τὸν πατέρα* would express much less filial piety. Or, to take a phrase more closely resembling the instance before us, *δεινὸν ποιεῖσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα* is "to make the matter terrible to one's self," or "to account it strange:" *δεινὸν ποιεῖν τὸ πρᾶγμα* would be, "to make the matter alarming to others." Now the root of *ἅζομαι* is *ἀγ*, the same root as in *ἀγ-νὸς*, *ἅγ-ιος*, *ἅγος*, *ἀγ-ίζω*, &c., which appears also in Latin in the forms *sac* and *sanc* in *sacer* and *sanctus*. Only the imperfect present and past tenses of *ἅζομαι* are found in use; so that no verbal form shows the final guttural; but the great frequency of the change of *γ* into *ζ* in the imperfect tenses of primitive verbs, and the meaning of the word, leave no doubt as to its root. *Ἅζομαι* therefore will mean, "I make to myself sacred," "I account sacred," or "I revere"; and it may be inferred that *ἅζω*, if it had been used before the word became obsolete, used by a poet in whose mouth it was a living word, would have signified "I sanctify," or "I consecrate," that is, "I make an object of reverence to others," as *ἁγίζω* in later Greek.

III. There is a slight departure from ancient usage in the other passage of Sophocles to which allusion has been already made, Œd. T. 155 :—

— ἐκτέταμαι φοβερὰν φρένα, δείματι πάλλων,
'Ιήϊε, Δάλιε, Παιάν,
ἀμφὶ σοὶ ἁζόμενος, τί μοι, ἢ νέον,
ἢ περιτελλομέναις ὥραις πάλιν,
ἐξανύσεις χρέος.

Here old glosses explain ἁζόμενος by εὐλαβούμενος, φοβούμενος, quite rightly. The deity invoked is the oracular Apollo, whose response the Thebans are expecting; and the Chorus exclaim, "My fearful mind is on the stretch, I am trembling with alarm, dreading with regard to thee, what thou wilt accomplish for me." In the older poets ἅζομαι expresses the sentiment of reverence or religious fear, and is for the most part constructed with an accusative case of the object of reverence, which is generally either a god, or something hallowed by connexion with a god. Even where there is no accusative case, the sentiment implied is the same; as in Il. Ξ. 261, ἅζετο γὰρ μὴ Νυκτὶ θοῇ ἀποθύμια ἔρδοι. The claims of hospitality are the object of reverence in Od. ι. 478, where Ulysses says to the Cyclops, ἐπεὶ ξείνους οὐχ ἅζεο σῷ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ 'Εσθέμεναι. And the sentiment is similar, though much weaker, in Od. ρ. 401, μήτ' οὖν μητέρ' ἐμὴν ἅζευ τόγε, where Telemachus tells Antinous not to be withheld by respect for his mother, in whose house he was a guest, from giving a portion of the banquet to the beggar, the disguised Ulysses. It is worth while to observe incidentally, that the syntax in these passages of the Odyssey is different from the syntax of the verb in the Iliad. In this passage of Sophocles, the feeling expressed is not simply reverence for what proceeds from the god, but fear lest the response should be of evil purport. Some approach to such a meaning is made by Theognis, where he uses the verb to express fear of the wrath or retributive justice of the gods :—

Theog. 736.—Κρονίδη, σὸν χόλον ἁζόμενοι,
and 280.—μηδεμίαν κατόπιν ἁζόμενοι νέμεσιν.

Sophocles however seems to depart a little further from the old use.

The word is used once by Euripides, and strictly in accordance with ancient precedent, in Heracl. v. 600, δυσφημεῖν γὰρ ἅζομαι θεάν. But it is desirable to say a few words, to protest against its being obtruded upon him by modern critics in two other passages in a false sense. In Orest. v. 1109 (ed. Matth.), we find δὶς θανεῖν οὐ χάζομαι, "I do not shrink from dying twice:" and in Alcest. 338, πρὸ τούτου γὰρ λέγειν οὐ χάζομαι, "for I do not shrink from speaking in the stead of this man." In both these passages Elmsley (in a note on Heracl. 600) proposes to read οὐχ ἅζομαι, in the sense of "*I do not fear,*" and is followed by Monk and Hermann in their editions of the Alcestis. In the Alcestis indeed the Scholiast interprets the words as οὐχ ἅζομαι, and they had been so edited by

Barnes; and in the Orestes two MSS. (but only two) have the same reading. However, the more common reading is the true one. Monk is right in remarking that *χάζομαι* is used by Homer only in the physical sense of *retreating* or *withdrawing* (as *ἀναχάζομαι* is by Xenophon in the Anabasis); and Euripides has put a metaphorical meaning upon the word, for which we have no earlier authority. But the metaphor is a natural one, and does not imply any misunderstanding of the earlier use of the word; and it is important to observe, that the passages of Xenophon show that the word was still living in the language, and therefore a poet could deal with it freely. But the reading *οὐχ ἅζομαι* would make Euripides use the obsolete verb *ἅζομαι* simply for *fear*, where not the slightest sentiment of reverence enters into the feeling. Matthiæ, who retains the old readings, has perceived distinctly the state of the case, and explained clearly the objection to the proposed change: "Equidem causam nullam video, cur *οὐ χάζομαι* rejiciatur: in *retrocedendo* certe inest notio etiam timoris, ut, qui modus verbis timendi jungi possit, eumdem nihil mirum sit etiam retrocedendi verbis jungi. Latini etiam poetæ dicunt *non refugio dicere*, et Apoll. Rh. iv. 190, *μηκέτι νῦν χάζεσθε —— πάτρηνδε νέεσθαι.* Ἅζεσθαι autem non tam est *timere, reformidare*, quam *vereri*, etiam Il. Ξ. 261. Soph. Œd. T. 155."

IV. The neuter noun *ἕλωρ* is used by Homer eight times, always in the sense of "a prey," "that which is taken;" as in Od. *ε*. 473: *δείδω, μὴ θήρεσσιν ἕλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένωμαι.* Ἑλώρια, the plural of a derivative form *ἑλώριον*, is used once in the same sense, Il. A. 4. Another plural form *ἕλωρα* occurs also once, but in a different sense, in Il. Σ. 93. Achilles says that he has no desire to live:—

αἴκε μὴ Ἕκτωρ
πρῶτος ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπεὶς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσῃ,
Πατρόκλοιο δ' ἕλωρα Μενοιτιάδεω ἀποτίσῃ.

Here *ἕλωρα* may mean "the capture," that is, "the slaughter," as *ἑλεῖν*, though properly meaning "to take," is used also for "overcoming and slaying in battle;" and then the sense of *ἀποτίσῃ* will be the same as in Od. *ν*. 193, *πρὶν πᾶσαν μνηστῆρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτῖσαι*: and in Il. X. 271,

— νῦν δ' ἄθροα πάντ' ἀποτίσεις
κήδε' ἐμῶν ἑτάρων, οὓς ἔκτανες ἔγχεϊ θύων;

or *ἕλωρα* may mean "*the penalty for slaying*," and *ἀποτίσῃ* be used as in Il. Γ. 286, *τιμὴν ἀποτινέμεν.* On account of the plural form of *ἕλωρα*, the latter meaning seems to be the preferable one, according to the analogy of *ζωάγρια, μοιχάγρια, ἄποινα*, and *λύτρα, μήνυτρα*, &c. in later Greek. But in either way *ἕλωρα* has not the same meaning as *ἕλωρ*, or the meaning that a plural of *ἕλωρ* would have.

Some grammarians refer this plural form *ἕλωρα* to a singular nominative *ἕλωρον*; others consider it merely as the plural of *ἕλωρ*; and Messrs. Liddell and Scott are of this opinion. There is however reason to think that the former hypothesis is more in accordance with the analogy of the language. Ἕλωρ, τέκμωρ, πέλωρ and ἐέλδωρ are neuter nouns in ωρ, belonging to the old Homeric language; and if we set aside this form ἕλωρα, none of them is declined; I mean that none of them is found in any form but the nominative and accusative singular. Τέκμωρ is manifestly the same word as τέκμαρ in the later poets (see Buttmann's Lexilogus on τέκμωρ and τεκμαίρεσθαι), which also is not declined: and it seems that in all of them the ω may be considered as a peculiar lengthening of the vowel in the nominative and accusative (as in the anomalous form ὕδωρ with the cases ὕδατος, ὕδατι) which could not extend itself to other cases.

We consider the ω as a peculiar anomaly, because we think that it may be laid down as a general rule, that the vowel in the final syllable of the stem or crude form of neuter nouns of the third declension is short. It might have been said that the final syllable is short; for there is only one word in which it ends in two consonants, viz. γαλακτ, the stem of the noun γάλα, γάλακτος. The real exceptions to this general rule are very few, if any. Several apparent exceptions are produced by contraction. Thus the genitives ὠτὸς, στητὸς, ἦρος, are contracted from οὔατος, στέατος, ἔαρος. Κρᾱτὸς, the genitive of κάρη or κάρα, is contracted from καρήατος. Δουρὸς results from the transposition of δορυ-ος. Φῶς, φωτὸς, for *light*, belongs only to the later Greek, and is so declined by a false analogy. As the nominative φῶς is the contraction of φάος, the only genuine forms of the genitive are φάεος, φάους. It does not appear how late it is before the cases φωτὸς, φωτὶ, occur. The derived adjective φωτεινός is found first in the colloquial Greek of Xenophon's Memorabilia (iii. 10. 1, iv. 3. 4). The Attic forms φρέαρ, φρέᾱτος, *a well*; κέρας, κέρᾱτος, *a horn*; and στεᾱτιον, a derivative of στέαρ, στέατος, *suet*; are probably to be considered as exceptions peculiar to the Attic dialect, as we find φρειᾰτα in Homer (καὶ φρείατα μακρὰ νάουσι, Il. Φ. 197), and the ordinary form of declension of κέρας is κερᾶς; κέρᾰ-ος, κέρως, &c. The only real exception is σταὶς, σταιτὸς, *dough*; and after the examination which we have instituted, it will not be very rash to conjecture that this may have been originally σταΐ, σταΐτος. At any rate the principle is so general, that it becomes very unlikely that ἕλωρ could be declined as ἕλωρ, ἕλωρος, and so make a plural ἕλωρα. It is remarkable certainly, and in some degree contrary to analogy, if the ω in ἕλωρ be an anomalous lengthening peculiar to the nominative and accusative, as in ὕδωρ, that it should make derivative forms ἕλωρον and ἐλώριον; and in like manner that πέλωρ should make the noun πέλωρον, and the adjective forms πέλωρος and πελώριος. But it must be remembered, that as ἕλωρ and πέλωρ are not declined, there is no other form of the stem extant from which derivatives could be formed; and we have a clear example of the same kind of anomaly in the formation of the more recent word σκωρία, *dross*, from σκῶρ, σκατὸς, *dung*. With respect to this latter word, it may be noted that the lengthening of the vowel in the nominative is not anomalous, as the noun is a monosyllable.

Bopp, in his Comparative Grammar (§ 153, *note*), suggests that in nouns like *ἧπαρ, ἥπατ-ος*, the *ρ* and the *τ* both belong to the root, so that the root of this noun was originally *ἡπαρτ*. If this is the true theory, as the *τ* would necessarily be rejected from the nominative by the laws of Greek euphony, the lengthening of the vowel in the old forms of which we have spoken may be considered as a compensation for the loss of the position before two consonants; but if the nouns were declined, there is no euphonic reason for the rejection of the *τ* in the cases where it is not a final letter. We may observe, by the by, that if the root of *σκῶρ, σκατὸς*, were originally *σκαρτ*, the Latin *sterc-us* will have the same root; and this resemblance is some confirmation of the hypothesis.

To return to our subject; we have pointed out with certainty, that in Homer *ἕλωρα* differs in meaning from *ἕλωρ* or a plural of *ἕλωρ*; and we have shown that it is at least highly probable that *ἕλωρα* is not the plural number of *ἕλωρ*, but the plural of another noun derived from it. Nevertheless Æschylus in the Supplices, v. 781, undoubtedly uses *ἕλωρα* as synonymous with *ἕλωρ*, or rather *ἑλώρια* :—

κυσὶν δ' ἔπειθ' ἕλωρα κἀπιχωρίοις
ὄρνισι δεῖπνον οὐκ ἀναίνομαι πέλειν.

These lines are manifestly suggested by the

αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν
οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι

of Homer. As they are spoken by the Chorus, the fifty daughters of Danaus, Æschylus probably thought the plural form appropriate, and used *ἕλωρα* merely as the plural of *ἕλωρ*.

V. We believe that the tragic poets have made a slight innovation in the use of the masculine noun *φὼς, φωτός, a man.* It is used by Homer and the old poets to signify *a male person*; but it is never used for ***man*** as opposed to ***woman***, or ***man*** as opposed to *child*, as *ἀνήρ* is; and consequently never means ***husband***. The tragic poets however have all used it for ***husband***. In the Agamemnon of Æschylus, v. 1235, Cassandra speaks of Clytemnestra as *θήγουσα φωτὶ φάσγανον*, "sharpening the sword for her *husband*." And this is probably the meaning of the word in Eumen. v. 575 :—

οὐκ ἦν ὅμαιμος φωτὸς ὃν κατέκτανεν.

In the Trachiniæ, v. 177, Deianeira says,—

— εἴ με χρὴ μένειν
πάντων ἀρίστου φωτὸς ἐστερημένην.

So also in Aj. 807, Tecmessa says,—

ἔγνωκα γὰρ δὴ φωτὸς ἠπατημένη,
καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς χάριτος ἐκβεβλημένη.

In like manner in the Alcestis, v. 487, the Chorus say of Alcestis,—

σὺ δ' ἐν ἥβᾳ νέᾳ
προθανοῦσα φωτὸς οἴχῃ.

The word occurs so frequently in Homer, that we believe that if it had been altogether synonymous with ἀνήρ, so as to be capable of the meaning *husband*, we should have had some example of it.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Vol. II. JUNE 26, 1846. No. 50.

Professor Key in the Chair.

Capt. Chapman, Roy. Art., F.R.S., was elected a Member of the Society.

The following gentlemen were elected Honorary Members of the Society:—Professor Zumpt of Berlin; Professor Madvig of Copenhagen; the Honourable Albert Gallatin of the United States; and Heer de Haan Hettema of Frieseland.

A paper was then read:—

"On the Relative Import of Language." By the Rev. Richard Garnett.

The ordinary definition of words in general is, that they are names of things. Though this position was maintained by Horne Tooke with great ingenuity, it is far from being satisfactory. The analysis of language shows that names of material objects are uniformly descriptive epithets, and consequently not original; and there are moreover multitudes of words which are certainly not names of *things*, according to any legitimate meaning of the term. The statement that they are *pictures* of *ideas* appears still more liable to objection; in fact, it scarcely conveys any definite idea to the mind, so long as the terms idea and picture are so vaguely employed as is the case at present.

In an essay on the subject in a well-known periodical, words were defined by the writer as being indicative of the qualities or attributes of things. Though this might be defended, it is liable to the objection that things are often designated from qualities which they do *not* possess. A slight examination of the articles commencing with *an*, *in*, *un*, in a Greek, Latin, or English lexicon, will supply abundant examples of this, and a *negative* quality is, as far as property is concerned, no quality at all. It is therefore proposed, in lieu of the above definition, to state that they express the *relations* of things; and this, it is believed, is strictly applicable to every word in every language, and under every possible modification. Names of material objects express the individual qualities or the relations of those objects; names of mental faculties or phænomena are borrowed from the sensible properties of matter; and all other words, without exception, help to denote some category, circumstance or mode of existence. This existence may be either past, present or future, actual or hypothetical; but in one or other of these ways it must be at the root of all language; for *ex nihilo nihil fit*. As the arithmetician cannot operate upon mere cyphers, so language cannot deal with absolute nonentities, for this simple reason, that nullities cannot stand in any possible relation towards each other. As the able translator* of Sir William Hamilton's Essays well observes, "Not only all knowledge, but even all thought is ontological, inasmuch as every judgment, every notion, every thought, has for its object an *existence* actual or possible, real or ideal. Everything that is affirmed or denied is affirmed or denied respecting *being*, and being is what is affirmed or denied of all things. As, in the reality of things, besides being there is nothing, in like manner, in the human mind, there is not a single thought which has not being for its principle, its foundation, and its object. There is therefore no question whether our reason can know being; for in reality it does not and cannot know anything else."

The following remark by the same author is worthy of particular attention; as though not made by him with reference to that point, it appears to constitute the very foundation of the true philosophy of language:—" Our knowledge of beings is purely indirect, limited, relative; it does not reach to the beings themselves in their absolute reality and essences, but only to their accidents, their modes, their relations, their limitations, their differences, their qualities; all which are manners of conceiving and knowing which not only do not impart to knowledge the absolute character which some persons attribute to it, but even positively exclude it.......Matter (or existence, the object of sensible perception) only falls within the sphere of our knowledge through its qualities; mind, only by its modifications; and these qualities and modifications are all that can be comprehended and expressed in the object. The object itself, considered absolutely, remains out of the reach of all conception."

It is of the utmost importance to keep the above observation in mind in all speculations upon the nature of language. We are incapable of knowing any particle, aggregate or modification of matter as it is in itself; we only know it in its relations of similarity, diversity, or whatever else they may be, towards other objects of our perception. And as we *know* relations only, it follows that they are all that we can *think of* or *talk about*. A further consequence is, that no words are in their origin of concrete signification. All indicate phænomena which have no distinct independent existence, but only a relative one.

The relations in which the objects of our perceptions stand towards each other may be and are manifold and various. They may be near or distant, like or unlike, higher or lower, better or worse, united or separate, or in any conceivable degree of affinity or non-affinity. Now, of objects standing in such relation towards each other, the word descriptive of that relation may become the name by which any one of them is popularly designated. They may be characterized from what they do or do not do to each other, or from any possible shade of resemblance or contrast. Of course, the most

---

* M. Louis Peisse: 'Fragmens de Philosophie par M. W. Hamilton.' Pref. p. 88.

obvious and prominent relations are most likely to be fixed upon; but this is by no means necessarily the case: a terrestrial object, for instance, might receive its name from the sun, the moon, or the polar star, if any relation, real or supposed, could be traced between them. Either term of the relation may acquire its appellation from it: supposing A and B to be considered with reference to each other; A might be designated from some phænomenon connected with B, or *vice versâ*; or either of them might be characterized from something derived mediately through A or B from C or D. In scholastic language, such names may be either *subjective* or *objective*, a point which, though hitherto greatly overlooked, is of the utmost importance in the analysis of language. A few examples will place the matter in a clearer light.

In most Indo-European languages the numeral or adjective *one* forms various compounds and derivatives, often bearing apparently opposite significations. Thus, from the Irish *aon* we have *aonach*, a waste or moor, also a fair or great assembly; *aonta* and *aontugadh*, celibacy, also a joint vote or consent; with another derivative, *aontumadh*, marriage. In Welsh, *untref* (*un*, one + *tref*, town or habitation) means, of the same abode, townsman; while *untuawg* (*un*, one, *tu*, side) does not denote on the same side or allied, but *one-sided, partial*; Germ. *einseitig*. In like manner the Latin *unicus* implies solitude or singularity, and *unitas* association or community. The concord of this discord is easily found, if we consider that the term *one* may either refer to *one* as an *individual*, or in the sense of an *aggregate*. In its first acceptation *aonach* denotes *solitude*, implying that wastes or moors are commonly destitute of population; in its second it denotes aggregation, or the meeting of a multitude of people with a general unity of purpose. In like manner, the words *other*, *another*, may either express difference or addition, according as they are taken in a disjunctive or conjunctive sense.

In Anglo-Saxon the abstract noun *æmta* or *æmetta* means leisure, idleness, and its adjective *æmtig*, idle, vacant, empty. The Old-German *emazzig*, modern *emsig*, is the same word, but with a totally opposite meaning; namely, busy, industrious, occupied. The clue to this may be found in the Latin *văcare*, which, taken absolutely, denotes being vacant or idle; but when joined with *negotio* or some similar word, is equivalent to *occupari*, and implies diligence and close attention. The same diversity of meaning occurs in σχόλη and σχολάζειν. Σχόλη means leisure, idleness and at the same time a school, with its manifold occupations,—not because people necessarily idle away their time at school, but because they are free from manual labour and all similar interruptions of their studies. Thus *vacans negotio* and *emsig* express vacuity or leisure—not absolute and entire, but from all business except that in hand; and, by implication, time and power to attend to it alone. Had our word *emptiness* followed the same course as the Latin and German, it might very well have acquired the sense of diligence or industry along with its present one, the primary idea being the same in all.

It may be observed, once for all, that as every voltaic current has its positive and negative pole, so every relation has its positive and negative, or subjective and objective aspect, either of which may give its character and complexion to the word used to express it. To borrow Euler's excellent illustration of negative quantities, a man's debts are negative as far as relates to right of property, but positive with respect to his obligation to pay them; while, with respect to his creditors, the same debts are negative as to actual possession, but positive as to right. The word may pass from its positive to its negative acceptation, or *vice versâ*: for instance, when we speak of a deceased merchant's debts, we are supposed to mean the sums due from him; but when we talk of his good and bad debts, we are understood to imply those owing to him by others.

The following may serve as a familiar example of the same thing receiving different names from its different attributes. In Icelandic, *lyckill*, a key, is derived, naturally enough, from *lyckia*, to shut or lock; and the German *schlüssel* (from *schliessen*), the Greek κλεῖς, with many other terms in various languages, follow the same analogy. But a key may be employed to open as well as to shut, and therefore it is with equal propriety in Welsh called *agoriad*, from *agori*, to open. In other languages it is designated by terms implying crookedness, from its usual form; and it might be equally denominated from the idea of access, security, confinement, prohibition, or any other notion connected directly or indirectly with a key or its offices.

Again, the word *lee*, as applied to the side of a ship, is referred by etymologists—and it is believed rightly—to the Anglo-Saxon *hleo*, shelter, as being covered or protected from the direct action of the wind. Dr. Jamieson excepts to this derivation, on the ground that it is not applicable to *lee-shore*. A little consideration would have shown him that there is no real ground for the objection. When a ship ascends the Thames with a cross north wind, the Essex side is the weather-shore and the Kentish the lee-shore—not because they are respectively exposed to and sheltered from the wind, the reverse being the case, but with relation to the weather-side and lee-side of the ship that is passing. The term is subjective as applied to the ship, and objective with reference to the shore. This example, with many similar ones, may serve to show, that as rays of light may be refracted and reflected in all possible ways from their primary direction, so the meaning of a word may be deflected from its original bearing in a variety of manners; and consequently we cannot well reach the primitive force of the term unless we know the precise gradations through which it has gone. Had lee-side been lost or forgotten, we should have been not a little puzzled to give a rational explanation of lee-shore.

There is perhaps no more remarkable instance of the intrinsically relative nature of language than the names of the points of the compass, at least in certain classes of tongues. Everybody admits that these points vary according to locality, and that the north of London is not the north of New York. Most people however would suppose that, with reference to a fixed point, Greenwich Observatory for example, the terms for the cardinal divisions could not with propriety interchange with each other. This may be true as to the Teutonic languages, in which the precise original import of the terms is uncertain. But there are tongues in which, paradoxical as it may seem, any given point might have been designated by the name of any other. In the Semitic languages, and to a great extent in the Celtic, east, west, north, south, are respectively equivalent to *before*, *behind*, *left*, *right*. The congruity and propriety of the appellations evidently depend on the ancient practice of directing the view towards the rising sun, specifically for devotional purposes. But there was clearly no natural invincible necessity for taking this precise point of view and no other. The direction fixed upon might just as easily have been the setting sun, the meridian, or the north pole. In the first case every present designation would have been completely reversed. *Kedem* (front), now *east*, would have become *west*; *yamin* (right), *south*, would have been transformed to *north*, and so of the rest. In the second case all the points would have shifted ninety degrees sunwards; in the third they would have made a similar move in the opposite direction: thus all might travel by just stages round the horizon, and four different Semitic or Celtic tribes might have come to employ the same set of words in four perfectly distinct acceptations. It now remains to show that this is not mere theory, but that it has to a certain extent been realized in practice.

In Mosblech's 'Vocabulaire Français-Oceanien,' art. NORD, we find the following passage:—"The Islanders (Marquesans, Hawaiians, &c.) turn to the *west* in order to find the cardinal points; whence it comes that they call the north, right side, and the south, left side." A glance at the comparative tables in Humboldt and Buschmann's great work, 'Ueber die Kawi-Sprache,' will confirm the accuracy of this statement with respect to various tribes of Polynesians, western as well as eastern. When an Arab visits Java, he turns in the same direction as a Javanese to look at the southern cross; but if asked to express this direction in words, the Arab will say that it is *right* (yemen), and the Javanese *left* (kidul). In like manner, while looking out for omens, the Greek augur faced towards the north, the Roman to the south; consequently the *left*, *ἀριστέρα*, of the former was the western quarter, while the *læva* of the latter was the direct contrary. Thus, while each looked towards the east for auspicious omens, they denoted them by names of diametrically opposite import. As connected in some degree with this subject, it may be observed, that our Anglo-Saxon ancestors called the right hand *se swiðre*, the stronger or better hand, while the Greek *ἀριστέρα*, also meaning *better*, was applied to the *left*. The Saxon simply meant to express physical superiority; while the superstitious Greek, both in this case and in that of the synonymous term *εὐώνυμος*, strove to avoid words of inauspicious import. Thus we find that the word *left* has been, in point of fact, employed by different races to denote east, west, north and south, and that the simple relation itself may be, and is expressed by terms in one language, which in another have a totally different meaning.

The above examples, to which thousands of similar ones might be added, may serve to illustrate the positions advanced above, that words express the relations of things, and that those relations may be indifferently positive or negative, objective or subjective.

INDEX TO VOL. II.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

PRINTED BY RICHARD AND JOHN E. TAYLOR,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.